

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: Evaluation of Prince
George's County, Maryland
Day Reporting Program

Name of Degree Candidate: Lois LaChance Trader

Degree and Year: Master of Arts, 1996

Thesis Directed By: Professor Doris MacKenzie
Institute of Criminology
and Criminal Justice

Prefaced by an ever-increasing prison population, departments of correction are turning toward alternatives to incarceration for many non-violent, low-risk offenders. The need for alternatives to incarceration has spurred the development of community based programs to house these offenders.

Electronic monitoring, intensive probation, shock incarceration and community service are some of the community based programs currently available. The late 1980s introduced a further community based treatment program, day reporting. Based on a British model, day reporting is an extension of intensive supervised probation that incorporates counselling, rehabilitative and treatment services with intensive supervision. Since the inception of day reporting centers in Massachusetts, 22 states in the U.S. have developed and implemented 114 day reporting centers. While the content of each program differs, the underlying concept of public safety through intensive supervision and

offender rehabilitation remains constant across all programs.

In January, 1994, the Prince George's County, Maryland Department of Corrections, Community Corrections Division, together with the State of Maryland, Division of Probation and Parole opened a day reporting program to facilitate community reintegration of low-risk, non-violent offenders. This report provides a descriptive analysis of the program's first year of operation. The results indicate that while the Prince George's County Day Reporting Program implemented many of the initially proposed features, further effort must be made to ensure that all participants receive the necessary treatment and rehabilitative services.

EVALUATION OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND
DAY REPORTING PROGRAM

by

Lois LaChance Trader

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of The University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

1996

CI
MD

Advisory Committee:

Professor Doris MacKenzie, Chairman/Advisor
Professor Katheryn Russell
Professor Charles Wellford

Maryland
LD
3231
.1170m
Trader,
L.L.

DEDICATION

To Mom and Dad who provided the encouragement to continue when it seemed this tome would never be completed. And to Adam who sacrificed many "Mommy" hours to afford the completion of this research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This researcher applauds the administration and staff of the Prince George's County Day Reporting Program for their successful development and implementation of a day reporting program. Thanks and appreciation is extended to the entire staff of the Prince George's County Day Reporting Program for your assistance and patience over the past year during my data collection efforts.

I wish to thank Dr. Doris MacKenzie who provided much-needed guidance in the organization and drafting of a multitude of revisions to this paper as well as the encouragement to initiate original research at the thesis level and to continue when frustration reached its peak.

Thanks, too, are extended to Dr. Charles Wellford and Dr. Katheryn Russell, professors who I greatly admire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables	v
Chapter I: Introduction	1
Chapter II: History	5
Chapter III: Literature Review	9
1. Community-Based Alternatives to Incarceration	9
2. House Arrest/Home Confinement (Electronic Monitoring)	11
3. Intensive Probation Supervision	14
4. Day Reporting Centers	17
5. Various Existing Day Reporting Centers in the U.S.	24
6. Conclusions of Literature Review/ Further Research	31
Chapter IV: Prince George's County Day Reporting Program	34
1. Overview	34
2. Research Design	36
3. Proposed Program	39
Chapter V: Methods	46
1. Subjects	46
2. Procedure	46
3. Interviews	51
Chapter VI: Results	53
1. Offender Participants	53
2. Program Administration	57
3. Services Provided	61
Chapter VII: Discussion	70
Final Thoughts	78
Appendix	
A. Participant Data Collection Instrument	79
B. Code Book for Participant Data Collection Instrument	88
C. Administration Data Collection Instrument	93
D. Interview Questions for Day Reporting Program Administrators	98
E. Institutional Review Board Approval	100
References	116

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Demographic Composition Summary Instrument	101
1A	Demographic Composition Summary by Race	104
2	Program Administration Summary Instrument	106
3	Program Services Summary Instrument	110
4	Supervision Summary Instrument	113
5	Counselling Services Summary Instrument	114
6	Treatment Services Summary Instrument	115

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Rehabilitation has been the most controversial function of incarceration traditionally considered by penologists. Apart from deterrence, incapacitation and retribution, support for the rehabilitative model has fluctuated.

The late 1960s and early 1970s showed a flourish in the development of community based corrections programs. These programs, frequently directed at substance abuse, sought to rehabilitate offenders through behavior modification techniques and counselling. However, by 1974, Robert Martinson's review of rehabilitative programs coined the phrase "nothing works" to describe community based correctional programs.

Prefaced by the industry-wide agreement with the "nothing works" conclusion, criminal justice policymakers began implementing determinate sentencing schemes whereby imprisonment received increased public support and attention to rehabilitative programs diminished.

By the late 1980s, however, the "lock 'em up and throw away the key" mentality of the criminal justice system yielded prison overcrowding, prisoner's rights advocacy and judicially mandated prison population

caps. Focus again returned to housing offenders in the community, emphasizing rehabilitation.

The need for alternatives to incarceration has piloted the development of a wide range of community based correctional programs. Paramount to such programs is offender accountability while resident in the community. Secondly, importance is placed upon addiction treatment and rehabilitative services. Examples of such programs include electronic monitoring, intensive supervision probation, shock incarceration (or boot camps), and community service. The late 1980s introduced a further community based treatment program, day reporting. Based on a British model, day reporting is an extension of intensive supervised probation that incorporates counselling, rehabilitative and treatment services with intensive supervision.

Replication of the day reporting model of community corrections began in the U.S. in the State of Massachusetts. Since the inception of day reporting centers in Massachusetts, a total of 22 state Departments of Correction have developed and implemented 114 day reporting centers. While the content of each program differs, the underlying concept of public safety through intensive supervision and

offender rehabilitation remains constant across all programs.

In January, 1994, the Prince George's County, Maryland, Department of Corrections, Community Corrections Division, in conjunction with the State of Maryland, Division of Probation and Parole, opened a day reporting program to facilitate community reintegration of low-risk, non-violent offenders. The initial goals of the program were to provide enhanced monitoring of offenders in the community while offering rehabilitative services to assist clients in returning to a crime-free, addiction-free lifestyle. Long-term program goals include reducing the Prince George's County jail population as well as reducing recidivism.

As rehabilitative theory comes and goes with changes in social attitudes towards crime, so do the programs offering rehabilitative services. To determine the effects of a rehabilitative program within a criminal justice system, an evaluation is conducted of each new community based program in an effort to support or refute the value of each such program. The Prince George's County Day Reporting Program requires such an evaluation. The infancy of the Prince George's County Day Reporting Program, however, prohibits the standard randomized statistical design usually conducted to determine the effect of

such a program. Thus, the review provided herein of the Prince George's County Day Reporting Program's services and accomplishments to date will provide a descriptive analysis of the program and its first year of operation.

Since the concept of day reporting is fairly new to the field of criminal justice, any research conducted on day reporting facilities is well needed research. This information will provide foundational data on which further enhancements may be made to improve the concept of day reporting.

CHAPTER II: HISTORY

The criminal justice system in the United States is forever changing. Although the goal remains to protect public safety, the focus on how to accomplish this goal has shifted from retribution to deterrence to incapacitation to rehabilitation, based on the overwhelming influence of public policy.

Retribution purports to achieve the goal of protecting society by imposing harm for harm committed. In furtherance of the impact of retribution, deterrence attempts to prevent harms to society by providing examples to would-be offenders of what happens to those who harm society. Incapacitation, going to the extreme, prevents further harm to public safety by removing the offender from society for extended periods. Rehabilitation, however, attempts to protect society by changing an offender's behavior and returning him as a contributing member of society (Palmer, 1992).

While retribution (i.e., an eye for an eye) is no longer acceptable in modern criminal justice and deterrence only works for certain offenders and offenses, support for methods of achieving public safety generally sways between incapacitation and rehabilitation. From 1965 through 1975, the criminal justice system focused on the development of

rehabilitative programs in both prisons and the community (Palmer, 1992).

Support for the rehabilitative ideal took a drastic turn, however, after the publication in 1974 of Robert Martinson's "What Works? -- Questions and Answers About Prison Reform". Martinson, after reviewing a multitude of research literature on rehabilitative programs, pronounced "nothing works" when describing the effectiveness of community correction programs. Although Martinson later recounted this statement, a tone had been set for the criminal justice system (Palmer, 1992).

The late 1970s and 1980s showed a marked increase in public support for and the use of incarceration as a means of achieving public safety (Palmer, 1992). Prison construction increased, and, where construction was improbable, doubling-up cell space became standard. Concerns of overcrowding grew rapidly (Palmer, 1992).

By the late 1980s, the judicial system became involved in the correctional aspect of criminal justice. Prison population caps were judicially imposed and correctional officials were faced with the dilemma of how to handle an ever increasing prison population (Palmer, 1992). Public support, once again, shifted to rehabilitation.

Alternative sanctions to incarceration began to receive a great deal of attention within the criminal justice system. Such alternatives would serve as the primary means of diverting offenders from incapacitation, and throughout the 1980s an increasing number of such alternatives began to appear (Palmer, 1992). Fines, house arrest, boot camps, intensive supervision probation, community service orders, among others, were imposed as a means of diverting offenders from incarceration (Byrne, Lurigio & Petersilia, 1992). The community would now be utilized to house offenders.

Many programs, such as intensive probation supervision and house arrest, concentrated on tracking offenders while in the community as a means of protecting public safety. Boot camps, or shock incarceration, attempted to protect society by removing offenders to a military style environment for a short term in an effort to deter future criminal activity. Fines and community service orders attempted to impose financial and time sanctions on offenders as a means of deterrence (Palmer, 1992).

Researchers continue to evaluate many of these community based sanctions to determine if the programs actually serve the purposes of incarceration in terms of punishment, rehabilitation and public safety. While

several methods seem promising, none has been shown to produce a major reduction in recidivism (Palmer, 1992).

CHAPTER III: LITERATURE REVIEW

Community-Based Alternatives to Incarceration

Community-based alternative sanctions, ranging somewhere "between prison and probation" have begun to be used in the majority of state criminal justice systems, as well as at the federal level (Morris and Tonry, 1990). The overall idea is that community-based alternatives can serve to both punish and supervise an offender while maintaining community safety and reducing the cost of incarceration. House arrest (or home confinement), electronic monitoring, fines, boot camps (or shock incarceration), intensive supervision probation, day reporting centers, and community service orders exemplify the realm of community-based sanctions.

The goals of community-based sanctions are the same as incarceration: supervision, incapacitation and punishment (Byrne, Lurigio & Petersilia, 1992). However, community-based sanctions attempt to achieve these goals while reducing prison populations and maintaining safety in the community. Criminal justice agencies benefit too from the reduced costs of operating community-based programs as compared to the costs of incarceration.

An additional aspect of intermediate sanctions is that of treatment and/or rehabilitation (Byrne, Lurigio

& Petersilia, 1992). In addition to supervision and punishment, many community-based programs offer treatment programs and rehabilitative services to dependent offenders. Drug and alcohol abuse rehabilitation is primary to the operation of community-based programs. Restitution and community service is another feature of community-based sanctions not typical to incarcerative sentences.

Are intermediate sanctions meeting their goals? Are these programs in fact cost effective? Are recidivism rates lower for offenders sentenced to community-based sanctions? Researchers continue to answer these questions through intensive review of the various community-based programs. The following is a review of current literature relating to various community-based intermediate sanctions.

A review of recent research in the areas of home confinement and intensive probation supervision is presented. These intermediate sanctions have many features in common with the concept of day reporting. The foundation established by these earlier programs provides the building blocks to which additional rehabilitative programs can be added in the design and implementation phases of a day reporting center. Research in these areas provides the statistical analysis of what features aid in successful program

implementation, what features need to be enhanced, and what features do not affect a program's outcome.

After a review of home confinement and intensive probation supervision, an analysis of the concept of day reporting will be presented providing the history of the concept, characteristics of the day reporting concept as a program and a description of existing programs (Parent, 1990).

House Arrest/Home Confinement (Electronic Monitoring)

Home confinement began in the United States as an alternative to juvenile detention (Jolin & Stipak, 1992). Home confinement was offered as a means of avoiding the psychological destructiveness of incarceration, allowing the use of community treatment resources, avoiding the severing of family and community ties, and maintaining adequate control of offenders without the expense of incarceration (Renzema, 1992). The rapidly growing use of home confinement has been driven primarily by the need to manage jail and prison overcrowding. As an alternative to incarceration, home confinement has been declared to be both retributive and punitive (Jolin & Stipak, 1992).

One of the most widely evaluated home confinement programs is Florida's Community Control Program (FCCP)

(Baird & Wagner, 1990; Smith & Akers, 1993). This program was designed specifically to reduce prison crowding through diversion to house arrest/electronic monitoring. Baird and Wagner (1990) compared pre (before 1981) and post (September 1, 1987 - December 31, 1987) program rates of incarceration for the offender groups targeted by FCCP. They conducted a comparative analysis of offenders receiving various sanctions (probation, jail and FCCP) in 1987, followed by a multivariate, analytical technique to predict what sanctions FCCP participants might have received if the FCCP did not exist. The authors concluded that community control has not attained its principal goal of reducing prison crowding by diverting offenders from prison.

Smith and Akers (1993) conducted a five-year survival analysis of the recidivism rates of offenders in Florida's Community Control Program. Using a quasi-experimental design, the authors compared offenders from Cell 2 of the Florida sentencing guidelines who were sentenced to the FCCP with a partially matched sample of offenders from Cell 2 sentenced to prison, based on four recidivism measures. Sample and control groups were matched by sentencing score, offense type, age and previous violations of probation. The groups were not matched on race or prior felonies.

Significance tests comparing the sample characteristics determined that the groups differed significantly on race and prior felonies. The experiment showed that there is little difference in overall recidivism between the two groups. Four out of 5 recidivated in the follow up period (61% of FCCP and 60% of prison group). The median survival time to rearrest for the FCCP group was 13.5 months and for the prison group, 14.5 months. The authors concluded that sentencing to FCCP makes no difference in officially detected criminal recidivism.

Jolin & Stipak (1992) conducted a quasi-experimental comparison group design and a non-experimental one-group pretest posttest design to determine if an intensive drug treatment program combined with electronically monitored home confinement is an effective community-based sentencing option. Their research and statistical analysis of the Clackamas County, Oregon, Intensive Out-Patient Drug Program indicates that the program is working. Intensive drug program participants have lower recidivism rates versus ESP (home confinement/electronic monitoring, without drug treatment) and work release counterparts.

Intensive Probation Supervision

Intensive probation supervision (IPS, also referred to as intensive supervision probation, ISP) is a widely used intermediate sanction. IPS is regarded as the best means for relieving prison crowding and ensuring public safety (Petersilia, 1990). IPS is more stringent than ordinary probation in that it requires a higher number of contacts with probation officers, subjects offenders to random drug and alcohol testing, enforces curfews and requires community service (Byrne, et al., 1989).

Since 1985, jurisdictions in 40 states and Washington, D.C. have implemented IPS programs (Byrne, 1990). IPS programs are based on the assumption that increased supervision, the threat of early detection of new crimes, and speedy revocation and subsequent reincarceration, will deter offenders from recidivating. Although IPS does not concentrate heavily on the rehabilitation of offenders, attendance at community counselling sessions is strongly encouraged (Byrne, 1990).

IPS programs differ in terms of their specific goals (diversion, relieve overcrowded prisons), offender recruitment (front-end, back-end, current probationers/parolees), level of supervision (number of weekly contacts, type of contacts, i.e., face to face,

phone, electronic monitoring), duration, size of caseloads and type of offenders recruited. Two of the most successful ISP programs exist in Georgia and New Jersey. Georgia's IPS program is a front-end release mechanism for prison-bound offenders (Erwin, 1987). Its goal is to prevent offenders from entering prison in the first place. New Jersey's program admits offenders through a back-end or early-release mechanism for persons already in prison (Pearson & Harper, 1990). Its goal is to relieve institutional crowding.

Pearson's and Harper's review of New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program indicates that ISP is able to hold recidivism to a reasonable level at a reduced cost compared to typical incarceration (Pearson & Harper, 1990). Erwin's evaluation of Georgia's IPS program found that IPS reduced the prison population, cost less than prison and produced less recidivism than regular probation (Erwin, 1987).

Petersilia and Turner (1990) conducted a randomized experiment testing the effects of intensive probation supervision in three counties in California. The program, co-sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the RAND corporation, found that ISP offenders are more likely than regular probationers to incur technical violations but not more likely to incur new arrests or incarcerations.

Conducting a randomized experiment in Texas, Turner and Petersilia (1992) determined that intensive probation supervision is not associated with fewer arrests even though ISP offenders received more contacts than regular supervision; ISP offenders had a larger number of technical violations than the control group; and ISP cost 1.7 times as much as routine supervision. Turner and Petersilia suggest that if officials are interested in flexibility in sentencing decisions, ISP holds promise. If however, interest lies in reducing recidivism and costs, ISP will likely fall short.

Turner, Petersilia and Deschenes (1992) conducted a randomized field experiment, funded by Bureau of Justice Assistance and RAND, testing the effects of intensive supervision probation/parole for drug involved offenders. In a descriptive analysis of the five tested jurisdictions (Contra Costa, CA; Seattle, WA; Des Moines, IA; Santa Fe, NM and Winchester, VA), the researchers found that ISP offenders were seen more often, submitted more often to drug tests, received more drug counselling and had higher levels of employment than the control group on routine probation/parole. One-year recidivism outcomes showed a higher proportion of ISP offenders having technical violations (primarily for drug use). ISP did not

reduce the proportion of persons being arrested, the seriousness of the crimes for which they were arrested and the total number of arrests during the one-year follow up. It was concluded that ISP is more often associated with increased recidivism and costs more to operate than routine supervision. The authors state that more intensive monitoring results in higher not lower rates of recidivism and costs. The requirement and frequency of drug testing alone is virtually guaranteed to generate higher technical violations (Turner, Petersilia & Deschenes, 1992).

Day Reporting Centers

The above mentioned intermediate sanctions focus primarily on the increased supervision of offenders while serving sentences in the community. The day reporting concept builds on intensive supervision probation by providing rehabilitative and counselling services to offenders as well. Given that day reporting is a concept, not specifically defined, many of the existing programs differ in terms of offenders served, level of supervision, services offered, duration, etc. (Curtain, 1992). Until a recent descriptive analysis conducted by Abt Associates, Inc., at the request of the National Institute of Justice, very little descriptive documentation existed on day

reporting centers (Parent, Byrne, Tsarfaty, Valade, Esselman, 1995).

The concept of day centers first emerged in Great Britain in the 1960s (Parent, 1990). Noting that prisons were full of many chronic, low risk, alcohol and drug dependent offenders who lacked basic skills to survive lawfully, corrections reformers proposed the concept of day centers. As an alternative to confinement, day treatment centers provide supervision and counselling with a rehabilitative theme (Mair, 1990). Program content focused on topics such as communications, self-image, relationships with others, finding jobs, health issues, social service benefits, alcohol and drugs, money management, and job training skills (Parent, 1990). While programs vary in content, duration and offender recruitment, the idea of rehabilitative services remained constant. The most common rehabilitative services offered include job seeking skills and placement, drug abuse education and treatment, group and individual counselling, and life skills training (Parent et al., 1995). It is the combination of punishment, treatment and intensive supervision that embody this alternative to incarceration.

The concept of day reporting was identified for use in the U.S. by the Crime and Justice Foundation

(the "Foundation"), an independent criminal justice research organization in Boston, Massachusetts, as a means of alleviating the overcrowding crisis in the Massachusetts correctional system (McDevitt, Pierce & Miliano, 1988; Curtin, 1990; Warwick & McCarthy, 1990). The Foundation conducted a national study in search of promising correctional alternative programs. The alternative programs must serve as an intermediate option between incarceration and probation, provide for the reintegration needs of offenders, and satisfy the goals of punishment, incapacitation and rehabilitation. The Foundation found examples of such programs in London where the British probation system had effectively established day centers. These centers were voluntary, run out of the Court Probation Offices, seen as a last chance to stay out of prison, short term in nature, 60 day maximum, community-based, and drew on the community for all professional and educational services (Larivee, 1990).

Through a grant from the National Institute of Justice, Dale Par ent conducted a review of the available literature on day reporting (Parent, 1990). The result of Parent's extensive review was a handbook detailing the history of day reporting and the procedures necessary for the development and implementation of a day reporting program.

According to Parent (1990), a great deal of preplanning is necessary to the development and implementation of a day reporting center. Consideration must be given to the purpose, goals, and services to be offered by a day reporting center. For example, attention must be given to recruitment of offenders, level and means of supervision, program rules and regulations, handling violations of rules and regulations, development of daily itineraries, community service, etc. Staffing and training must be considered before the implementation of a program (Parent, 1990). A discussion of each of the issues described by Parent (1990) as relevant to the implementation of a day reporting program follows.

Recruitment. Recruitment of offenders to participate in day reporting occurs at both the "front-end" and "back-end" of the criminal justice system. Front-end recruitment seeks pre-trial detainees, ineligible for and unable to make bail, who otherwise would be sentenced to local jails until trial. Front-end recruitment also seeks low risk, nonviolent offenders serving sentences of less than two years in local jails. Front-end recruitment attempts to relieve overcrowding at the local jail level by diverting offenders to alternative means of supervision in the community.

Back-end recruitment seeks incarcerated offenders near the end of a sentence, probationers, and parolees. At the back-end of a sentence, day reporting attempts to serve as a means of reintegrating an offender into the community after incarceration.

Day reporting may also be imposed upon probation and parole violators as an alternative to reincarceration.

Rehabilitation and Treatment. Rehabilitative and treatment services offered by day reporting centers vary as well. Many day reporting centers focus on supervising low risk, drug and alcohol dependent offenders. Addictive behavior counselling, whether individually through in-house counselors or in a group through community resources such as Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous, is of primary importance to the treatment nature of day reporting centers. As such, random urine and breath testing is a requirement of almost any day treatment center.

Rehabilitative services include education, employment readiness skills and life skills (such as interacting with others, awareness of and introduction to available health and social services, public transportation, and financial management).

Supervision. Offender accountability is critical to the success of a day reporting center. While levels of

supervision vary from program to program, supervision must fall within the minimal, monthly probation or parole reporting requirements, and the extreme reporting requirements of many intensive supervision probation programs. To this end, day reporting centers require daily contacts as well as required attendance at certain in-house rehabilitative functions provided by the program. Electronic monitoring equipment may also be used to monitor an offenders adherence to curfew regulations.

Itineraries. Daily itineraries are extremely important to the daily supervision of offenders. Itineraries should detail an offenders every move from morning until evening. Work schedules, travel time to and from work, daily check-in, community service, evening meetings, community treatment meetings, and curfew should be provided on a hourly, day to day basis. Daily itineraries should be developed by the offender in an effort to teach offenders how to structure a day. Itineraries should be approved by a program counselor and any changes thereto should be at the discretion of a program counselor.

Program Rules, Regulations and Violations. If an offender is removed from prison and placed on day reporting, probation or parole, thus freeing bed space, but is subsequently returned to prison for minor

violation of program rules, the goal of reducing prison crowding has not been achieved and has actually served to increase the prison population (popularly referred to as "net widening"). Therefore, strict adherence to designated program operation rules and regulations must be enforced on all offenders. To avoid net widening, minor rule infractions must be dealt with on a compounding basis. For example, increasing daily reporting requirements might be imposed on an offender who fails to report over a specified period of time; a positive urine or breath test might be subject to increased reporting requirements and/or more frequent testing.

Community Service. Community service is included in a day reporting program in an effort to have an offender give back to the community which he harmed.

Contact Lists. Contact lists, providing names, addresses and phone numbers, of an offenders family, friends, employers, acquaintances, and anyone with whom the offender frequents, must be obtained at the outset of day reporting. These contacts will provide a means of tracking an offender after completion of day reporting. Contact lists might also assist researchers when conducting a program follow up evaluation.

Various Existing Day Reporting Centers in the U.S.

In addition to the initial day reporting centers developed and implemented in Massachusetts, 21 states have begun operating day reporting centers. While day reporting centers are both privately and publicly operated, the majority are public programs operated by the judicial branch of state governments. About three-fourths of these publicly run programs are operated by a city or county government (Parent et al., 1995). Even though day reporting centers are still experimental within the U.S. correctional system, a review of the available data is presented beginning with a description of the initial programs in Massachusetts.

Massachusetts. Massachusetts was the first state in the U.S. to develop and open a day reporting center (McDevitt, Pierce & Miliano, 1988). The Hampden County Sheriff's Department together with the Crime and Justice Foundation opened the Hampden County Day Reporting Center in Springfield, Massachusetts in October, 1986 (Curtin, 1992). Three additional day reporting centers were established in Massachusetts, including the Metropolitan Day Reporting Center in Boston (1987), the Correctional Opportunity Advancement Program (COAP) in Worcester (1988) and the Electronic Incarceration Program (EIP) in Norfolk (1988).

Concerned about the direction of the rapidly growing day reporting centers, the Executive Office of Human Services developed a Day Reporting Center Task Force in 1989 (Curtin, 1992). This Task Force was to establish a set of guidelines for Massachusetts day reporting centers, and a data collection system for statewide use.

In 1990, the four original day reporting centers served close to 1,000 offenders (Curtin, 1992). Of those who finished the programs, 81% did so successfully, 16% were terminated due to technical violations, 2% failed due to escape and 1% failed due to the commission of a new crime. In 1991, nearly 1,500 offenders were served, with a 78% successful completion rate (Curtin, 1992). The Crime and Justice Foundation's evaluation concluded that day reporting centers are an effective and efficient method of community supervision in that they address public safety concerns, supervision, punishment, accountability, and client needs (Curtin, 1992).

Hampden County, Massachusetts Day Reporting Center.

The Hampden County Day Reporting Center is the first day reporting center to operate in the U.S. It began operation in October, 1986 and admitted over 100 offenders during its first year (McDevitt, Pierce &

Miliano, 1990; Warwick & McCarthy, 1990). The program provides a highly structured blend of sanctions, services and supervision while enabling an offender to live in the community prior to regular discharge from prison or parole (Curtin, 1990).

McDevitt, Pierce, Miliano, et al., 1988, provide a detailed descriptive analysis of the aspects to be considered in the development and implementation of a day reporting center in their evaluation of the Hampden County Day Reporting Center. They, too, provide a statistical analysis of the first 15 months of operation (October, 1986 through December, 1987) of the center. Most offenders came from the Hampden County jail. The median length of stay in the program was 40 days. The median age of the first year's participants was 27. Almost one-half of the participants in the day reporting program were white, one-third were hispanic and 16% were black. Years of education for first year participants was low, 60% did not complete high school, 15% completed eighth grade or less. Most of the participants had substance abuse problems, 83%. The length of the original sentence for offenders varied from 1 1/2 years to 6 months or less. Prior criminal convictions for offenders was high, only 18% had no prior criminal convictions.

Hampden County Day Reporting Center had an 81% successful completion rate in its first year of operation (McDevitt, Pierce & Miliano, 1990). Only 18 of the 96 offenders were terminated prior to program completion; five for positive urinalysis, five for being absent without leave, three for discovery of prior warrant, three for problems with employer, one for contract rule violation (as determined by counselor), one for commission of a new crime (drunk driving).

The statistics presented support the successful reintegration of offenders through day reporting. However, caution must be taken when interpreting the statistical results given the small sample size. These are merely descriptive statistics of a program's first year of operation; they were not derived from an experimental condition (McDevitt, Pierce & Miliano, 1990).

Ramsey County, Minnesota. The Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, Division of Services to Children and Families in cooperation with Ramsey County, Minnesota Community Corrections, developed a day reporting program as part of their center in late 1990. The Wilder Day Reporting Center offers an array of non-residential services for men and women on probation in the St. Paul area of Ramsey County. The center strives

to increase public safety by providing for the reintegration needs of offenders through increased accountability, practical assistance and counselling (Wasserman, 1991).

The highly structured blend of supervision, sanctions and support services is accomplished by a structured phase program in which participants must earn their way to the next phase (Wasserman, 1991). The three phases are progressively less restrictive and less structured. Case management coordinates, supervises and monitors each participant to ensure the appropriate level of supervision. A community reintegration contract is developed which states the goals of the participant while in the program. Check in and check out procedures are restrictive and enforced and daily itineraries are required. Community service work is required providing the offender the opportunity to give something back to the community. Structured educational and counselling services are required including life skills training, job readiness, assessing consequences of criminal behavior, etc. Participants are required to remain drug-free and are therefore subjected to random drug and alcohol testing.

Standard procedure for handling program rule violations has been developed: threatening/assaultive behavior, threatening and/or use of weapons/objects -

termination from program; new offense - could result in termination from program; other behavior deemed inappropriate by staff - first time: verbal warning, second time: written violation notice, continued non-compliance of program rules and regulations: imposition of additional consequences and eventual termination from the program (Wasserman, 1991). Alternative sanctions are also imposed for violation of daily itineraries, failure to inform program of change in school or employment, failure to attend required group sessions, and positive urine/breath test.

Connecticut. The State of Connecticut is the first state to statutorily mandate the use of alternatives to incarceration. In 1990, the Connecticut General Assembly enacted legislation creating a statewide continuum of programs to augment the alternatives to incarceration available to the criminal justice system (Justice Education Center, 1993). The characteristics of Connecticut's Alternative Incarceration Centers (AICs) are comparable to the general concept of day reporting: community based punishment, rehabilitative and counselling services (i.e., addiction counselling), intensive supervision, community reintegration. Connecticut has extended the use of AICs to pre-trial detainees as well as sentenced offenders (Justice Education Center, 1993).

In cooperation with the Justice Education Center, research was conducted in 1991 to develop an offender profile that identified pools of pretrial and sentenced offenders who could be considered for community based sanctions. In 1992, a court disposition study was conducted to analyze the primary considerations used by Connecticut courts to determine what type of convicted offenders would be incarcerated pretrial and after sentencing. This study helped to identify characteristics of people who could be considered for community supervision programs.

The Justice Education Center further conducted a comprehensive statewide evaluation of Connecticut's alternative to incarceration programs. Phase I evaluated the pretrial alternative to incarceration programs comparing defendants in the community on conditional release with a comparison group of defendants without conditions as part of their release. Phase II evaluated offenders sentenced to alternative to incarceration programs compared to similar offenders sentenced to incarceration and those receiving sentences that combine incarceration with community programming (Justice Education Center, 1993).

The pretrial defendants study determined that defendants released with conditions proved less risk to the community of new arrests and failures to appear in

court than defendants who were ordered to post bond without additional conditions (Justice Education Center, 1993).

Initial results of the sentenced offenders study indicate that offenders sentenced to carefully supervised community programs in most instances pose less risk to public safety as measured by new arrests than a comparison group of offenders who were released after having been incarcerated. Additionally, those categories of offenders who are typically the source of great concern to the public and policymakers, drug and violent crime offenders, are doing better in the first year than other types of offenders under community supervision (Justice Education Center, 1993).

Conclusions of Literature Review/Further Research

Community based programs attempt to achieve two of the primary goals of incarceration, supervision and punishment, while reducing prison populations and maintaining public safety. The above research in this regard is somewhat skeptical.

Baird and Wagner (1990) conclude that the home confinement of Florida's Community Control Program has not attained its principal goal of reducing prison crowding by diverting offenders. Smith and Akers (1993) concluded that sentencing to the Florida

Community Control Program makes no difference in officially detected recidivism. Jolin and Stipak (1992) concluded that intensive drug program participants have lower recidivism rates than counterparts sentenced to home confinement. As for intensive supervision, Petersilia and Turner (1990) concluded in their California survey that ISP offenders are more likely than regular probationers to incur new technical violations but not more likely to incur new arrests or incarceration. In Texas, Turner and Petersilia (1992), determined that intensive probation supervision is not associated with fewer arrests. Turner, Petersilia and Deschenes (1992), in a survey of five jurisdictions, determined that intensive monitoring results in higher not lower recidivism and costs.

The Crime and Justice Foundation (Curtin, 1992) concluded in their survey of the Massachusetts day reporting centers that day reporting centers are an effective and efficient method of community supervision in that they address public safety concerns, supervision, punishment, accountability, and client needs. McDevitt, Pierce & Miliano (1990) in their evaluation of the Hampden County, Massachusetts Day Reporting Center represent that the statistics support the successful reintegration of offenders through day

reporting. Evaluations conducted by the Justice Education Center (1993) of Connecticut's Alternative Incarceration Centers determined that offenders sentenced to carefully supervised community programs in most instances pose less risk to public safety as measured by new arrests than a comparison group of offenders who were released after having been incarcerated.

Palmer concluded in his review of community based correctional programs that while several community based programs seem promising, none has been shown to produce a major reduction in recidivism (Palmer, 1992). The literature reviewed here seems to support Palmer's conclusion. The general consensus of researchers, however, is that if community based programs maintain therapeutic integrity and are targeted to the appropriate offenders, a reduction in recidivism will occur. Community based programs will also show a marked reduction in recidivism if they are used as a back-end means of community reintegration, thus avoiding the reduced effects of net widening.

CHAPTER IV: PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY DAY REPORTING PROGRAM

Overview

The Prince George's County Day Reporting Program (PG DRP) was established to provide an alternative sanction to incarceration while reducing the population of the county correctional facility. The program is designed as a 90-day, back-end community reintegration sanction for non-violent, low risk offenders.

Recruits are received from the local correctional facility and from the State Department of Parole and Probation. The PG DRP accepts both male and females, many of whom have a history of substance abuse, who voluntarily agree to participate in the program.

The PG DRP accepted its first class of participants in January, 1994. An opening class of 50 participants, 25 from the local correctional facility and 25 from the State Department of Parole and Probation was anticipated.

An important aspect of a community-based sanction is that of supervision and offender accountability (Byrne, 1990). The PG DRP has developed a generic daily itinerary for participants, detailing daily events, hour by hour, from 7 AM to 10 PM curfew. Separate itineraries exist for clients who are employed and those who are unemployed.

In order to verify that clients are abiding by itineraries, the PG DRP employs five probation/parole agents who are responsible for conducting weekly field checks. These field checks are made at home, work and recreation and/or rehabilitation activities. The program requires at least one and sometimes two field checks per week, per client.

In addition to employing agents responsible for community field checks, the PG DRP employs three counselors who are responsible for case management, program development and implementation, as well as client counselling. Counselors conduct daily group counselling sessions and coordinate with community organizations to provide rehabilitative services to clients (i.e., Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous).

In an attempt to rehabilitate participants, the PG DRP requires clients to participate in group and individual counselling sessions. The day reporting program offers employment education and training, general education, life skills training, including but not limited to stress/anger management, banking, library usage, public transportation, education and job readiness skills, and peer support groups.

The day reporting program also requires participants to remain drug-free while in the program.

To enforce this rule, clients must agree to submit to randomized breath and urine testing, conducted both at and away from the center.

Participation in community service projects is required. The terms of participation are dependent upon whether or not an offender is employed. Community service is conducted in cooperation with the Prince George's County Police Department, Community Oriented Policing (COP) program. Police officers and CTCs supervise day reporting offenders while at community service projects.

Demographic information is collected on all participants, together with criminal history and contact lists (i.e., names, address and phone number of family and friends).

Research Design

The research proposed herein is an evaluation of the Prince George's County, Maryland Day Reporting Program's first year of operation. Although this particular program currently serves to facilitate community reintegration for offenders nearing the end of a sentence, a successful program could certainly serve as an alternative to incarceration by focusing on offender rehabilitation instead of incapacitation.

The purpose of this research is to determine what administrative features the PG DRP implemented during

the first year and what features the DRP was unable to implement.

The records kept by the DRP staff for each participant who entered and completed the day reporting program from January, 1994 through December, 1994 were reviewed. Data were collected detailing the specific rehabilitative and treatment services proposed to be delivered to DRP participants, according to the initial funding proposal. These proposed services were compared to the services actually received by DRP participants.

It is hypothesized that the rehabilitative services received by participants in the DRP are what will serve to increase the participants rate of successful program completion. The rehabilitative services will be quantified by the type and number of rehabilitative and treatment services a participant received during the 90 day program. This variable will be measured by attendance at and therefore receipt of a rehabilitative or treatment service.

It is expected that participants who receive a higher number of rehabilitative and treatment services during the 90 day program will be less likely to recidivate than participants who received or participated in fewer services. However, at this writing, an offender's time in the community after

program completion is relatively brief so rate of recidivism will not be measured. Since the DRP has proposed to follow DRP graduates after program completion, this data may lend itself to a future longitudinal time series analysis based on time to rearrest.

In the current study, data were recorded on the Participant Data Collection Instrument (see Appendix). The codebook for the Participant Data Collection Instrument describes the methods by which the following data was collected: DRP attendance, age, race, gender, marital status, children, referring agency, program completion, household composition, substance abuse history, educational background, offense, prior incarceration, employment status, sentence length, sentence served, screening, client assessment, counselling, family education, life skills training, continuing care, job training, community supervision, urine and breath tests, weekend and daily check in, itinerary and pay stub verification. Additionally, data were collected detailing the administrative features of day reporting that were proposed to be implemented.

Although notably the least favorable research design, because of its lack of a scientific control, the research proposed herein is a one-group design

measuring the services received by one sample, the program participants of the DRP's first year. While conclusions of this research may be relatively weak in scientific relevance, the purpose is to describe the DRP's first year of operation, to examine whether the program was implemented as proposed and to suggest improvements to the program.

Proposed Program

The initial funding proposal, prepared in 1993 by the Department of Corrections and the State of Maryland Division of Parole and Probation, submitted to the Governor's Drug and Alcohol Abuse Commission, projected the implementation of a multiagency day reporting program. The descriptive narrative portion of the funding proposal itemized the requisite characteristics of a day reporting program, as detailed in then-current research literature (Parent, 1990). The characteristics sought by the Department of Corrections for inclusion in the PG DRP during the first year are described below. These descriptions are particularly important because they will be compared to the data showing what actually was implemented during the first year of operation of the PG DRP.

Screening and Assessment. Initially proposed are four 90-day classes of 50 participants. Twenty-five (25) referrals to PG DRP should come from the State

Department of Parole and Probation and 25 referrals should come from the County.

Participant screening was proposed to be implemented by both the State and the County. All referrals to the PG DRP must be Prince George's County residents with no pending charges. The State Department of Parole and Probation proposed to utilize the PG DRP for mandatory supervisees, technical violators, and as a graduated sanction for offenders coming out of the State system (i.e., as an aftercare program for boot camp graduates). The County proposed to refer to the PG DRP offenders with 90 days remaining on a sentence and offenders assigned to mandatory probation.

Assessment of an offenders substance abuse history, vocational abilities and/or needs, and academic skills was proposed as necessary to the implementation of a day reporting program. Upon completion of the proposed assessment, an individualized treatment plan should be developed for each offender. As part of the proposed risk assessment/classification of offenders, the cooperation of an Evaluation, Diagnosis & Referral (EDR) expert from the Prince George's County Health Department is expected to facilitate rapid admission of offenders to available County-sponsored treatment programs.

Supervision and Substance Testing. The PG DRP proposed to supervise offenders in the community through daily check-ins, where an offender must report to the program site by 7:00 AM each weekday morning and Saturday. The development of daily itineraries detailing an hourly accounting of each participants daily activities is another feature important to offender supervision in the community. Random verification of itineraries is proposed by the PG DRP. Random home and employment checks are also proposed by the PG DRP and are very important to the implementation of a day reporting program in terms of offender accountability.

Random urine tests to check for drug use and breath tests to check for alcohol consumption are also imperative to supervising an offender in a community program that requires an addiction-free lifestyle.

Counselling and Treatment Services. Counselling was proposed to be available to participants on an individual and a group basis. Individual and group counselling efforts are imperative to a day reporting program as these efforts are what sets a day reporting program apart from regular probation. It is anticipated that increased counselling will achieve stronger community reintegration of offenders and, in the long run, reduce a participant's reentry into the

criminal justice system. Counselling is imperative to support a participant's addiction free lifestyle.

Rehabilitative treatment proposed by the PG DRP, i.e., job training, life skills, educational assistance, is also an important feature that sets day reporting apart from traditional community based corrections.

Community service projects in cooperation with the Prince George's County Community Oriented Policing program were to be identified by the Police Department and attended to by PG DRP participants.

The coordination of community resources and referrals such as church groups, Narcotics Anonymous (NA) and Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), social services, support groups, public transportation, community mentors to assist participants after completion of the PG DRP, and local businesses for possible employment, were proposed to be implemented by the PG DRP staff. Program Administration. Administratively, the PG DRP proposed to employ three Correctional Treatment Coordinators (CTCs) and five Probation/Parole Agents (Agents). The CTCs would each be assigned to one of three proposed phases of the DRP - Phase 1 to include interviewing, intake and pretesting, counselling, monitoring service providers and criminal background checks; Phase 2 to include community resource referral,

community service projects, counselling and vocational assessment; Phase 3 to include supervision of mentors/volunteers, counselling, job development, community service and continuing care placement. The CTCs are also proposed to administer urine and breath tests, attend weekly team assessment meetings, maintain case management, and schedule offender itineraries.

The Agents are to be responsible for conducting community supervision and contacts as well as urine and breath tests conducted during off-site visits.

A clerk for administrative support is proposed as part of the PG DRP staff. Training of the PG DRP staff was also proposed.

The central PG DRP facility is proposed to be located on Brightseat Road in Landover, MD. The central facility is to include classrooms, a conference area and a lounge. The development of satellite offices at Capitol Heights, MD (Hampton Mall) and Hyattsville, MD (Justice Center) is proposed.

User Fees. User fees for employed PG DRP participants are proposed. The cost of urine tests are proposed to be incurred by employed offenders as well. Pay stub verification of employed participants is also proposed.

The establishment of a revolving account for transportation subsidies for unemployed participants is proposed.

Information Database. A computerized information system to track participants after completion of the PG DRP is proposed. Such a system is to be established by the State Department of Parole and Probation and cases are to remain in such system for three years.

Graduated Sanctions. A system of graduated sanctions is proposed including such sanctions as termination, disciplinary hearing, forfeiture of privileges, increased supervision and electronic monitoring.

Assistance of Community Organizations. Several programs within Prince George's County were initially targeted to assist the day reporting effort. The Action Training Institute, Inc. (ATI) proposed to provide pretest/posttest occupational assessments and aptitude tests as well as providing employment services, including, employability skills, job training, job placement and career enhancement. Higher Educational Learning Program, Inc. (HELP) proposed to provide supportive services including housing assistance, family services, life skills and decision making training as well as providing supervision for peer support groups. The Board of Trade proposed to assist with providing job training scholarships, employment opportunities and mentors. Minority contractors proposed to provide on-the-job training, employment and mentors.

The establishment of a Community Advisory Board was also initially proposed. The Advisory Board would provide the community with a vehicle for input in the treatment of day reporting participants as well as assisting with the recruitment of mentors.

The above-proposed elements of the PG DRP will provide a well-rounded community program if they can all be achieved. A review of the PG DRP records will document the achievements of the administrators and staff in implementing a day reporting program.

V: METHODS

Subjects

The subjects of this research are the offender participants of the Prince George's County DRP and the staff of the State and County Departments of Correction assigned to the PG DRP.

Offender Participants. The offender participants are all 89 candidates to enter and leave the Prince George's County Day Reporting Program from January, 1994 through December, 1994, including both those who successfully completed the program and those who failed to completed the program.

Staff. The staff of the PG DRP include administrators for both the County and the State assigned to the PG DRP, the Correctional Treatment Coordinators responsible for counselling, developing and implementing the PG DRP, and the Probation/Parole Agents responsible for community supervision of participants.

Procedure

The University of Maryland Institutional Review Board has approved (see attached approval form in Appendix) a proposal to evaluate the Prince George's County Day Reporting Program by the University of Maryland, Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology. The nature of this research is

encompassed within this evaluation and the Review Board's approval therefore applies hereto.

To ensure anonymity, each PG DRP participant will be identified by state identification (SID) code. The information correlating offender name and SID code will be maintained by the PG DRP administrators.

Data were collected via review of the records maintained by the CTCs, Agents and the state and county administrators of the PG DRP. Since a wide range of information has been recorded by the PG DRP staff, there are many different sources for obtaining the proposed data to be collected herein.

A review was conducted of each participant's "Participant Profile" maintained by the assigned CTC. This profile included the demographic and background information for each offender as well as maintaining all reports pertaining to an offender's participation in the PG DRP.

Since the PG DRP receives offenders from the State and the County, available intake and assessment information may vary. The clients referred to the PG DRP from the State have already been screened initially for either boot camp, parole or probation, and therefore intake and assessment information may only be available at the PG DRP if it has been forwarded by the State referring agency.

For participants referred to PG DRP from the County, Evaluation, Diagnosis & Referral (EDR) reports prepared by the County Health Department were reviewed. This report included information regarding an offender's drug abuse history and the proposed treatment of same. Home investigation logs prepared by Agents containing notes of family interviews, accessibility to transportation and presence of a telephone within the proposed community residence were reviewed. RAP sheets and intake reports were reviewed.

To assess community supervision, Agents reports and field notes were reviewed. These notes and reports recorded the dates, times and location of community contacts. Verification of adherence to itineraries was also recorded in Agents notes and reports.

Daily sign in/out sheets were reviewed to verify offender reporting. Logs of attendance at required counselling sessions were also reviewed. A review of the daily scheduling of the PG DRP was conducted by the random on-site verification of the interviewer at the PG DRP and/or other locations of the scheduled activities.

Program rule infractions and the associated sanction were recorded in the Participant Profile reports. These reports included any problems offenders have encountered (for example, positive urine tests,

failing to report, not following itineraries) and what sanction, if any, had been imposed as a penalty.

Administrative features such as the four 90-day classes with 50 participants, 25 from the State and 25 from the County were assessed by evaluating participants' date of entry into the PG DRP.

Whether a multiagency day reporting program was implemented was verified through the source of referral of each participant, again found in the Participant Profile. If participants were referred from both the State and the County criminal justice systems, then this goal of a multiagency DRP has been implemented. If not, interviews with DRP administration will determine the barriers encountered in participant referral.

Screening data including information such as follows was collected from client assessment forms: source of client referral, county residency and pending charges.

Community resources are proposed to be available to participants through the PG DRP. These resources include church groups, AA/NA programs, social groups and support groups. Local businesses also proposed to assist the DRP with on-the-job training and employment opportunities for participants. Participant Profiles recorded data verifying the availability of these

community resources to PG DRP participants, as well as contacts made with community mentors. Participant Profiles also contained information regarding public transportation subsidies, daily itineraries and team assessment meetings.

A site visit to the central DRP facility in Landover, Maryland, confirmed the availability of a classroom, conference area and lounge, as initially proposed.

Urine and breath tests are proposed to be conducted by CTCs and probation/parole officers. A review of the logs recording the issuance of a test specified the date of such test, who administered the test and the results.

A system of graduated sanctions for participants violating DRP rules was proposed, including program termination, disciplinary hearings, forfeiture of privileges, increased supervision and electronic monitoring. A review of Participant Profile reports and administrative reports documenting participants terminated from the program provided evidence supporting the implementation of such intermediate sanctions.

To determine if the number of treatment and rehabilitative services received by PG DRP participants during the 90-day program affected overall program

completion, a SERVICES variable was created. SERVICES aggregated the number of times a participant received the following treatment and rehabilitative services: individual counselling, peer counselling, life skills training, job training, NA meetings, AA meetings, drug dealers meetings, urine tests and breath tests.

Interviews

After data collection had been completed and briefly analyzed to identify areas that were not implemented during the first year of operation, it was necessary to conduct personal interviews with the administrators of the PG DRP from both the State and County. These interviews provided additional information explaining why a particular initially proposed element of the PG DRP was not implemented, i.e., legal implications, lack of cooperation, financial restrictions, etc.

Administrators. A questionnaire (see Appendix) was developed seeking additional input from PG DRP administrators regarding the initially proposed features for which no evidence was found during data collection. A follow-up interview was held with Ed Williamson, the County-appointed PG DRP administrator, who provided further insight into the encumbered features. Mr. Williamson also provided information

pertaining to level of staffing, user fees, information tracking, and the Community Advisory Board.

Staff. Informal interviews and/or discussions were continuously held with PG DRP staff throughout this research. The content of these interviews were of a general clarifying nature, i.e., explanation of codes by which CTCs and Agents wrote reports, describing the content of peer group meetings, etc.

CHAPTER VI: RESULTS

The following is an analysis of the services rendered to participants during the program's first year of operation. The program will be described in three parts: offender participants (including a demographic description of the population served), program administration, and services provided (including screening and assessment, supervision and substance testing, counselling and treatment services).

Offender Participants

The PG DRP received and treated a diverse population of offenders in 1994 as shown in Table 1. The racial make up of the program consisted of African American, Caucasian, and Hispanic. Eighty-nine participants began the PG DRP in 1994; 35 of 89 (41%) were terminated and did not successfully complete the program. Data was missing regarding on participant's completion.

Both males and females participated in the PG DRP, ranging in age from 18 to 49. The average age of participants was 28.51, with a standard deviation of 6.58. Since the program was intended for first time offenders, this average age is somewhat surprisingly high.

Educationally, the participants varied greatly. The majority (55.1%) had completed high school, with an

additional 13.5% educated beyond high school. The next largest group were those who entered but did not complete high school. Very few (3.4%) of the participants never entered high school.

As expected, the unemployment rate was high, 55.8%. Many participants, however, were employed either full- or part-time.

The marital composition of the PG DRP population was diverse including single, married, divorced and separated. The greatest majority of the participants resided with a parent while in the PG DRP. Others lived with friends, siblings or other family members. At least one participant resided in a homeless shelter.

The implementation of the PG DRP was indeed a multiagency effort. Prince George's County Department of Corrections recruited 50.6% of the participants in 1994 and the State of Maryland Department of Corrections recruited 49.4% of the participants. As anticipated, a large number (83.7%) of the participants had prior criminal histories and 69.7% had substance abuse problems.

Offenses of the PG DRP participants varied but as anticipated centered greatly around drug-related crimes such as distribution, possession, and possession with intent to distribute. Other offenses included theft, assault, motor vehicle violations, and miscellaneous

other crimes. The length of original sentence being served by PG DRP participants was distributed as follows: 15% serving 0-6 months; 28.3%, 7-12 months; 20%, 13-18 months; 6.7%, 19-30 months; and 30%, more than 30 months.

The typical participant in the PG DRP was an unemployed, single, black male over 25 years of age with a high school education, criminal history and substance abuse problem who was serving less than 12 months for a drug related offense and who resided with family while in the PG DRP. Statistical tests were run to examine the differences between those who completed the PG DRP and those who did not. Completing and non-completing participants differ only in terms of offense, prior criminal history and services at $p \leq .05$ (see Table 1). There were no other statistically significant differences between completing and non-completing participants.

Offense. Surprisingly, those participants with drug related offenses were more likely to complete (74.1% complete) than participants with other offenses (38.5% complete). This relationship is statistically significant ($p < .05$) which indicates that there is a relationship between the variables.

Criminal History. Not surprisingly, those participants with criminal histories were less likely

to complete (56.3% complete) than those without prior offenses (92.9% complete). This relationship is statistically significant ($p < .05$) which indicates that the variables are related.

Services. Of the total participants receiving 25 or fewer services, 52% did not complete the PG DRP, while those receiving 26-50 services or more than 50 services, 23% and 20% respectively, did not complete. The relationship between services and successful completion is statistically significant ($p < .05$) which supports the hypothesis that participants receiving the greater number of services will be more likely to successfully complete the PG DRP. Caution, however, must be taken when interpreting this variable given that it is comprised of other variables that are not equally weighted. For example, a SERVICES value of 3 could be either 1 NA meeting, 1 breath and 1 urine or 3 individual counselling sessions.

Demographic Characteristics and Race

Blacks were more likely not to complete than non-blacks (blacks: 42.0% non-complete, 58.0% complete; non-blacks: 31.6% non-complete, 68.4% complete). This relationship between race and successful completion is not statistically significant (see Table 1A). I also examined whether there were other differences related to race. The only significant differences between

black and non-black participants were in employment and substance abuse history (see Table 1A).

Employment. Of the 67 cases recording a participant's level of employment, 65.7% of the blacks were unemployed, 20.9% were employed full time and 13.4% employed part time. Of non-blacks, 42.1% were employed full time, 36.8% employed part time and 21.1% were unemployed. This relationship between employment and race is statistically significant ($p < .05$). Blacks were less apt to be employed.

Substance Abuse. Sixty-four point three percent (64.3%) of the blacks had substance abuse problems; 35.7%, none. Eighty-nine point five percent (89.5%) of the non-blacks had substance abuse problems; 10.5% (2), none. This relationship is statistically significant. More of the blacks reported substance abuse problems.

Program Administration

Questions posed by this study relating to program administration are shown on Table 2. As indicated in the table, the multi-agency day reporting program was implemented. Recruits were received from both the County and the State. However, only 89 participants were recruited, well below the target population of 200, four 90 day classes of 50 participants.

Staffing. The PG DRP recruited, trained and employed three Correctional Treatment Coordinators and

five Probation/Parole Agents to implement the program in 1994. A clerk was also employed during this time to handle administrative duties for the overall program.

CTCs conducted case management and individual counselling sessions, directed group counselling sessions, collected urine specimens, administered breath tests, scheduled itineraries, attended weekly team assessment meetings and coordinated and administered community service projects. Although it was initially intended that each CTC would implement a particular phase of the proposed three phase program, the phase system was abandoned prior to implementation and a caseload system was implemented instead. The caseload system provided a more equal and concentrated balance of time, effort and program development.

Agents were responsible for offender accountability through supervision. Home contacts, employment contacts and daily itinerary verification were among the duties of Agents. Although initially proposed that agents would conduct random home and employment checks, it developed that Agents telephoned participants in advance of a visit thus negating the randomness originally intended. Agents were also requested to conduct random urine specimen collections during field visits. This procedure, however, was not

instituted due mainly to the Agents ill-comfort with the procedure.

CTCs and Agents, as new County employees, received a standard employment orientation. Training was also provided in report writing, interpersonal communication, inmate programs, inmates with special problems, and legal aspects of corrections.

Program Location. The PG DRP facility is centrally located within Prince George's County, Maryland at Brightseat Road in Landover. It is accessible to public transportation and proximate to both county courthouses and jails. The facility consists of a conference area, classroom, lounge and administrative offices.

While the PG DRP initially proposed using the existing Corrections Department offices at Hampton Mall (Landover, MD) and Hyattsville, MD for off-site meetings with participants in those locales, this procedure was never implemented. Aftercare peer group sessions for State boot camp graduates were held at the Hampton Mall location for a short period but were cancelled due to lack of interest and attendance. These aftercare groups were mandated for all boot camp graduates and are not specific to the PG DRP. Only PG DRP participants referred to the program from the boot camp partook of the aftercare peer group sessions.

User Fees. In an effort to defray some of the financial responsibilities of the PG DRP, it was anticipated that employed offenders would pay for services provided by the DRP, i.e., urine screening (see Table 2). This cost-saving mechanism was abandoned in the early stages of the program due to logistical problems (i.e., collection, possible necessity of a court-ordered mandate).

Graduated Sanctions. Graduated sanctions, on the other hand, were instituted by the PG DRP as a means of handling participants with minor program rule infractions. Infractions such as untimely daily reporting, uncooperative behavior, inadherence to curfew and even a first positive urine or breath test were handled by imposing increased reporting requirements, or adding additional days in the program, or earlier curfew. Electronic monitoring as a PG DRP graduated sanction had not been approved by the Department of Parole and Probation for use during the 1994 term.

The most serious infractions were generally positive urines and continual failure to report. These infractions resulted in termination from the program, the most frequent sanction imposed on 40% of the participants.

The already-established Community Corrections Advisory Board served as the Advisory Board for the PG DRP. The Board consists of representatives from the Departments of Education and Criminal Justice and community leaders. The Board helps to support the efforts of the PG DRP at budget times by recommending to the Prince George's County Council the continued use and funding of the day reporting program.

Services Provided

Screening and Assessment. All prospective PG DRP participants were screened and assessed prior to acceptance into the program. All participants during 1994 were Prince George's County residents. A few difficulties were encountered with participants attempting to reside out-of-county but these instances were quickly resolved.

A computer search was conducted of National Crime Information Center (NCIC), Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS), Maryland State Police (MSP), 1029 (Sheriff's Department), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA) to determine if prospective participants had any pending charges. Evidence of such a search was available in 72% of the participant files reviewed. Twenty-five percent of the records reviewed produced no evidence of such a search. Three percent, or two, of

the participants actually entered the program prior to the discovery of pending charges. Upon notification of such pending charges, however, these participants were revoked and returned to jail.

To fulfill the PG DRP's proposal as a back-end community reintegration sanction, the PG DRP recruited and accepted participants with 90 days remaining on their respective sentence. Candidates who graduated from the Maryland State Boot Camp were also recruited to participate in the PG DRP as a more intensive means of probation before referral to regular probation. See Table 3.

Upon acceptance to the PG DRP, participants were assessed, with the assistance of an Evaluation, Diagnosis & Referral expert from the Prince George's County Health Department, for emotional stability, employment skills and needs, vocational abilities, and academic abilities or needs. Sixty-eight and one-half percent of the 1994 PG DRP population actually received the EDR assessment.

The information discerned from the EDR and other program evaluations assisted the CTCs in developing an individual treatment plan for each participant. Records indicate that a majority of the participants were provided with detailed treatment plans which addressed a participant's need for development in the

following areas: legal status, family/social skills, employment, education and substance abuse treatment.

Specific academic ability assessments and vocational assessments were administered to participants with a need and desire for such improvement. Evidence also existed of participant referrals to the Literacy Council but no further documentation was found to detail the experiences or achievements of these referrals.

Supervision and Substance Testing. Accountability of DRP participants is of primary importance. The PG DRP therefore required twice daily telephone check-ins of participants. The raw data collected herein indicates that participants checked-in by telephone an average of 66 days of the 90-day program (see Table 4). This average, however, is not the most accurate indicator of daily check-ins given that it includes both successful and unsuccessful program participants whose time of attendance ranged from 1 day to 108 days. The mode, the most frequently appearing raw number, for daily check-ins, 99, is somewhat more accurate given that the majority of participants completed the 90-day program.

Participants were also required to check-in to the PG DRP in person. Unemployed participants were to report on a daily basis, i.e., Monday through Saturday,

and employed participants were required to report in person at least three times per week. As participants' length of time in the program increased, in person reporting requirements were frequently reduced as a reward for successful compliance with program rules. Daily reporting requirements continued as a means of strictly monitoring those participants receiving such reward. In person check-ins ranged from 1 to 47, the average being 14 and the mode, 20. This level of monitoring is quite low for a program whose population is mostly unemployed.

As a further means of supervising participants in the community, the PG DRP required participants to develop, and revise on a weekly basis, an itinerary which detailed a participants day-to-day, hour-to-hour activities. Records indicate that 74% (66) of the participants developed at least one weekly itinerary. Of these 74%, the average participant revised an itinerary three times during the 90-day, 14-week program. See Table 4.

Agents used weekly itineraries to monitor participants in the community both at home and work. It was initially intended that Agents would randomly verify participants' itineraries to ensure compliance, however, as both a time saving and cost effective

measure, Agents generally telephoned ahead of a visit with a participant to ensure availability.

An employed participant was required to notify an employer of the participants attendance at the PG DRP. This permitted agents to verify employment and job attendance both in person and by telephone. Employers generally cooperated with PG DRP Agents in verifying a participant's whereabouts, attendance and job performance. Successful employment contacts were made with 50 of the 89 PG DRP participants. Employment contacts ranged from 1 to 16, with an average of 5 over the 90-day program. See Table 4.

As an additional means of accounting for employed participants, pay stub verification was implemented by PG DRP staff. Forty-one participants provided this additional employment verification via pay stub verification.

Agents successfully conducted home visits with 77 of the 89 PG DRP participants. Home contacts ranged from 1 to 17, with an average of 9 successful home contacts over the 90-day program.

PG DRP participants are required to remain free of illegal substance at all times during the program and are encouraged to attend counselling and support groups to adhere to such a life style. Since the majority of PG DRP participants have a history of substance abuse,

random urine and breath tests were utilized by PG DRP staff to monitor such abstinence. Urine and breath tests were proposed to be conducted both at the PG DRP facility as well as during off-site visits. All tests were conducted at the PG DRP facility. Records indicate that 81 of the 89 participants in 1994 were subjected to urine screenings. The number of urine screenings over the 90-day program ranged from 1 to 25 with an average of 7. Breath screenings were conducted on 51 of the 89 participants, ranging from 1 to 11 with an average of 3. See Table 4.

Given that the majority of PG DRP participants had substance abuse histories, this is where the greatest difficulty was encountered in terms of program rule infractions. A one-time, admitted use of an illegal substance was tolerated by PG DRP staff and a participant was sanctioned accordingly upon completion of an infraction hearing. Two substance-related infractions, or one substance-related infraction coupled with other program rule infractions, resulted in termination from the PG DRP. The records do reflect the PG DRP staff's efforts to invoke a graduated system of sanctions in an effort to afford a participant's continued reintegration and program participation.

Counselling and Treatment Services. The distinguishing feature that sets day reporting apart

from probation is the offering of counselling and treatment services. The PG DRP offered participants both individual and group counselling sessions. Life skills training, job training and employment education are also available to participants. Treatment services concentrating specifically on substance abuse support groups are also offered and encouraged by the PG DRP, i.e., Narcotics Anonymous, Alcoholics Anonymous and Drug Dealer Support Groups. Tables 5 and 6 summarize this data.

Individual counselling sessions were attended by 84 of the 89 PG DRP participants in 1994. Attendance at these sessions ranged from 1 to 23, with an average of 5 over the 90-day program. Peer group counselling sessions were attended by 47 of the 89 participants. Life skills training, an eight class training program, was received by 21 of the 89 participants. Job training, which partly encompassed employment evaluation and interviewing techniques as well as job searches, was received by 42 of the 89 participants.

Attendance at Narcotics Anonymous support groups centered among 44 PG DRP participants. Alcoholics Anonymous support groups were attended by 14 PG DRP participants and drug dealer support groups were attended by 21 participants.

Community Services. The PG DRP initially proposed to seek the assistance of various community organizations with the implementation of services to be provided to program participants. The Community Oriented Policing division of the Prince George's County Police Department assisted the PG DRP in locating and participating in community service projects. The PG DRP required employed participants to complete 50 hours of community service and unemployed participants to complete 100 hours. Sixty-four of the 89 participants took part in community service activities. The number of constructive hours returned to the community by PG DRP participants totalled 2,780, individually ranging from 3 to 155, with an average of 43 (see Table 6).

As for the assistance of other community organizations, the Action Training Institute, which initially proposed to assist the PG DRP with occupational assessments and aptitude tests, was defunct by the time the PG DRP accepted its first class. The Board of Trade was also unable to assist the PG DRP in areas of job training, employment opportunities and mentoring. Assistance was received from the Higher Education Learning Program, Inc. HELP assisted the PG DRP staff in areas of housing assistance, family services, life skills training, and

supervision of peer support groups. Minority contractors, contacted through the Prince George's County registry of contractors, provided vocational training and employment opportunities to PG DRP participants. Local churches provided volunteers and mentors to the PG DRP.

CHAPTER VII: DISCUSSION

The administrators and staff of the Prince George's County Department of Corrections and Maryland State Department of Parole and Probation made great strides in 1994 with the implementation of a multitude of features comprising the PG DRP. As any program in its infancy can attest, there are always means of growth and continued improvement. So, too, this is true of the PG DRP. While successfully implementing many of its originally proposed features, the PG DRP encountered some difficulties. The previous chapter discusses the successful achievements of the PG DRP, while this chapter addresses those features the PG DRP was unable to implement and suggests areas for improvement.

Administration. The PG DRP was unable to implement the initially proposed four 90-day classes of 50 participants, due mainly to problems of recruiting qualified participants. Recruitment became increasingly difficult with the restriction of PG County residents only, the exclusion of violent felony charges, the exclusion of a history of violent felony charges, and the exclusion of inmates currently enrolled in other Correctional Center programs (i.e., work release, Awakings). Thus, the PG DRP was never able to enroll 50 participants at one time during 1994.

The PG DRP never instituted the three phases of program development initially proposed. Instead the administration redesigned the overall program operation by assigning CTCs caseloads instead of program phases. CTCs were responsible for a certain number of participants on their caseloads. Each CTC was, however still responsible for overseeing a particular component of the PG DRP, i.e., substance abuse, community service, employment, volunteers/mentors/interns. In discussions with PG DRP staff, there appeared to be a high level of frustration among CTCs and Agents which the staff would not specifically address. There, too, appeared a high turnover rate among CTCs and Agents which will certainly affect a program's performance.

The PG DRP administrators were unable to implement a means of collecting user fees from unemployed participants. The difficulties encountered here were mainly logistical centering around who would be responsible for collecting the fees and whether or not a court would mandate the payment of such fees if challenged.

In terms of assistance from community resources, the PG DRP never received assistance from the Board of Trade which proposed to assist with job training scholarships, employment opportunities and mentors. The Action Training Institute which initially proposed

to assist the PG DRP with occupational assessments, aptitude tests and employment services, was no longer in operation in 1994 and thus unavailable to assist the PG DRP with these services. Although the administration of the PG DRP confirms assistance from the Higher Educational Learning Program, Inc. (HELP) and minority contractors, no evidence was found in participants' files indicating specific assistance from either of those resources. Therefore, a numeric representation of the type and number of services provided therefrom remains uncertain.

Also uncertain is the assistance received from local church groups with the proposed recruitment of mentors. The data available in the participants' files regarding mentors, where sparsely available, appears to specify a mentor of the participant's choosing not a mentor provided by or necessarily supporting the goals of the PG DRP.

Participation in alcohol and drug treatment programs (NA, AA and dealers groups) was extremely low, according to the available recorded data, for a program whose participants have such a high rate of substance abuse. Table 5 indicates that one-half of the 89 participants attended an NA meeting and of the 44 who attended NA, the average attendance was three meetings over the 90 day program. Attendance at AA meetings was

accorded to only 14 participants, averaging four meetings. Drug dealers counselling was attended by only 21 participants, again averaging four meetings over the 90 day program.

Specific emphasis needs to be placed on the attendance at substance abuse counselling sessions. Given that the majority of participants will require such counselling, CTCs and Agents must work to ensure that participants attend these meetings even if it means imposing sanctions for non-attendance.

Attendance at weekly team assessment meetings by a member of the Prince George's County Community Oriented Policing Squad did not develop during 1994. The County Police Department did not believe this was a productive use of manpower.

The Prince George's County Health Department did assist the PG DRP with participant evaluation in terms of substance abuse, vocational needs and academic needs. However, this evaluation process was only provided to a portion of the PG DRP participants. For total effectiveness and needs assessment, this evaluation process must be administered to all incoming participants. After such a thorough evaluation, a treatment plan may be developed. Treatment plans, too, were only located in a portion of the participants' files. This procedure should be established for all

participants and used as a guideline for program compliance and progress.

Even though the Prince George's County Health Department cooperated with the PG DRP in terms of administering an Evaluation Diagnosis and Referral test, this did not facilitate rapid admission of PG DRP participants into County-sponsored treatment programs. Even after EDR referral, there remained a six-week period before treatment services were available. Many of the County-sponsored programs required user-paid fees and many of the unemployed PG DRP participants were unable to accord after referral and admission.

Family education classes were not implemented by the PG DRP during 1994 due to the lack of a qualified program facilitator.

Recordkeeping. While a great majority of the implemented features of the PG DRP were officially documented in Participant Profile reports and Agent's field notes, much area for improvement remained. The consistency of the reports varied widely. Some participants were adequately monitored and corresponding data were recorded to document this monitoring. Other files lacked the documented evidence to support the level of supervision and program rule compliance initially proposed by the PG DRP administrators in the funding proposal.

Agents and CTCs continually expressed anguish at the level of recordkeeping required for each case. An effort must be made by the PG DRP administrators to stress the importance of detailed records. After all, the most important feature of any community based corrections program is offender accountability. For example, daily call-ins were initially recorded in a participants chronological log maintained by the CTC and kept in the Participant Profile. In May, 1994, a daily calendar appeared detailing the time of each daily AM and PM call in -- a great recordkeeping method. It has come to the attention of this researcher that this well-documenting procedure is no longer being used by CTCs because it is too time consuming. Instead, CTCs and Agents will now assume daily call in unless otherwise stated in a weekly team assessment meeting and noted in a participant's file. This is a complete reversal of the proper compliance with the PG DRP rules.

Uniform recordkeeping must be maintained for all PG DRP participants. For example, logs for urine and breath tests should be separately maintained with the dates and results of each. This information was very sporadic in the 1994 participant files reviewed.

While participants were required to sign in each time they visited the PG DRP, this information was not

directly recorded in a participant's file. A separate log was maintained noting participants' name, time in and time out. It is suggested that an individual form be maintained in each participant's file detailing each such visit, the occurrences, and duration thereof.

Supervision. Electronic monitoring as a means of community supervision, and as a graduated sanction, was not available to the PG DRP in 1994. The State Department of Parole and Probation had not approved the use of or funding for such equipment by the PG DRP. The availability of such a monitoring capability would certainly serve to widen the recruitment effort as well as provide a deterrent sanction for rule infraction.

Of substantial importance to community supervision is the "surprise" effect of random home, employment and itinerary verification. The Agents of the PG DRP, however, negated such effect by calling a participant in advance of a home or employment visit, thus permitting a participant substantial time in which to comply with program rules (i.e., alcohol or drug use). This is an administrative duty that must be addressed. A determination needs to be made of exactly what causes Agents to phone ahead of a visit (i.e., time/cost saving mechanism, fear of what might be encountered during a random visit, etc.).

Agents, too, were requested to administer spontaneous urine and breath tests during off-site visits. Due mainly to Agents ill-comfort in administering urine tests off-site, this procedure was not implemented. It is the responsibility of the PG DRP administrators to enforce this duty upon Agents administering offsite accountability. It is a very important task.

FINAL THOUGHTS

It is the well-documented program that will have no difficulty seeking renewed funding. Documentation proves by hard fact exactly how a program has been operating and it is with this information that any researcher will be able to evaluate the successful contribution a program offers the criminal justice system.

I encourage the administrators and staff of the PG DRP to continue the hard work. The PG DRP program is a valuable asset to the participants served as well as the criminal justice system at large. Remember: document, document, document, and there will be no doubt of your successful contributions.

11. Household Composition (upon entering DRP):

- _____1 Alone
- _____2 Parent
- _____3 Sibling
- _____4 Spouse
- _____5 Friend
- _____6 Other Family Member
- _____7 Other _____

12. Employment Status (upon entering DRP):

- _____1 Employed (Full-time)
- _____2 Employed (Part-time)
- _____3 Unemployed

NOTE ANY CHANGES IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS WHILE IN DRP:

OFFENSE AND CRIMINAL HISTORY

13. Prior Criminal History:

- _____1 Yes
- _____2 No

IF YES, SPECIFY PRIOR OFFENSES:

14. Most Serious Offense of Conviction (specify offense for which participant was convicted and subsequently referred to DRP):

- _____1 Assault
- _____2 Battery
- _____3 Driving Under Influence
- _____4 Theft
- _____5 Drug - Possession With Intent to Distribute
- _____6 Drug Offense (not otherwise classified)
- _____7 Motor Vehicle Violation (not otherwise classified)
- _____8 Other - Specify: _____

15. Sentence: _____₁ 0-6 Months
 _____₂ 7-12 Months
 _____₃ 13-18 Months
 _____₄ 19-30 Months
 _____₅ More Than 30 Months

16. Length of Sentence Served Prior to Transfer to DRP
 (in Months/days):

_____ Months _____ Days

17. Referring Institution:

- _____₁ County Jail
 _____₂ County Probation
 _____₃ County Parole
 _____₄ State Prison
 _____₅ State Probation
 _____₆ State Boot Camp
 _____₇ Technical Violation
 (Parole/Probation)
 _____₈ Other - Specify: _____

18. Successful Completion of DRP:

- _____₁ Yes
 _____₂ No
 _____₃ Still In DRP

IF NO, STATE REASON FOR NOT COMPLETING DRP (i.e.,
 TERMINATION (state reason), DROP OUT):

Date of Termination:

Reason for Termination:

SCREENING:

19. County Resident: _____₁ Yes
 _____₂ No

20. Pending Charges (as determined by search of NCIC, etc.):

_____1	Yes
_____2	No
_____3	No Search Completed
_____4	No Evidence of Search in File

ASSESSMENT:

21. Evaluation, Diagnosis & Referral (EDR) Assessment Conducted:

_____1	Yes
_____2	No

Specify By Whom the Assessment was conducted:

22. Assessment Indicates Substance Abuse:

_____1	Yes
_____2	No

IF YES, SPECIFY SUBSTANCE OF CHOICE (i.e., type of drugs, alcohol):

23. Treatment Plan Established:

_____1	Yes
_____2	No

IF YES, SPECIFY:

By Whom Was Treatment Plan Established:

Detail Treatment Plan:

24. Academic Abilities Assessed:

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

IF YES, SPECIFY:

By Whom Was Assessment Made:

Areas For Improvement:

25. Vocational Abilities Assessed:

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

IF YES, SPECIFY:

By Whom Were Abilities Assessed:

Abilities/Skills:

26. Community Service:

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

IF YES, SPECIFY NUMBER OF HOURS ORDERED (dates of actual service will be recorded in calendar that follows):

27. Referral to Community Mentor:

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

IF YES, SPECIFY DATES PARTICIPANT MET WITH MENTOR
AND THE TYPE OF CONTACT (i.e., phone, in person):

28. Did Participant Have Any DRP Rule Infractions:

_____1 Yes
_____2 No

If YES, SPECIFY DATE OF INFRACTION AND HOW
INFRACTIONS WERE ADDRESSED BY DRP STAFF:

CALENDARS FOR SUPERVISION AND PROGRAMMING

COMPLETE CHART FOR EACH WEEK PARTICIPANT IS IN PROGRAM. FILL IN DATES ON CALENDAR FROM START DATE OF DRP TO COMPLETION DATE. PLACE AN "X" IN THE BOX FOR THE DATE ON WHICH EACH OF THE LISTED EVENTS OCCURRED.

	Sa	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
Daily Check In (by Phone)							
Check In (in Person)							
Phone Contact with DRP staff (other than daily check in)							
Meet with CTC at DRP (individual counselling)							
Meet with Agent at DRP							
Attend Family Education Session							
Attend Life Skills Training Session							
Attend Job Training Session							
Attend Peer Group Counselling							
Attend Group Counselling - Drug (i.e., NA)							
Attend Group Counselling - Alcohol (i.e., AA)							
Attend Drug Dealer's Group Counselling							
Urine Test - at DRP							
Urine Test - in Field (home or employ)							
Breath Test - at DRP							

	Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
Breath Test - in Field (home or employ)							
Phone Contact (successful)							
Phone Contact (No Answer)							
Phone Contact (Not at Home)							
Home Contact (successful)							
Home Contact (Not at Home)							
Employer Contact (By Phone - successful)							
Employer Contact (By Phone - Not at Work)							
Employer Contact (In Person - successful)							
Employer Contact (In Person - Not at Work)							
Weekend Contact - at DRP		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Weekend Contact (By Phone - successful)		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Weekend Contact (By Phone - No Answer)		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Weekend Contact (By Phone - Not at Home)		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Weekend Contact (In Person - successful)		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Weekend Contact (In Person - Not at Home)		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Random Itinerary Verification - successful							

	Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
Random Itinerary Verification - Not at Schedule Place							
Develop/Revise Itinerary							
Pay Sub Verification (copy of pay stub provided)							
Community Service (List Number of Hours)							

APPENDIX B
CODE BOOK FOR
PARTICIPANT DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

IF INFORMATION YOU ARE SEEKING IS NOT AVAILABLE (that is, the information does not appear in the DRP records) PLEASE LEAVE THAT QUESTION BLANK.

IF INFORMATION YOU ARE SEEKING IS MISSING (that is, there is a space provided to record such data in the DRP records but it is blank) PLEASE WRITE "MISSING" ON THE DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT.

- QUESTION 1: Record the State issued identification number assigned to the participant. If not available, record the Parole and Probation (P&P) case number.
- QUESTION 2: Record the date upon which participant began reporting to DRP. BEWARE: Records may indicate date of initial screening or meeting between participant and DRP staff - YOU DO NOT WANT THIS DATE.
- QUESTION 3: Record the final date the participant reported to DRP on a daily basis. This may not be directly recorded. You may need to discern/infer from the chronological record of the CTC and Agents.
- QUESTION 4: Record participant's date of birth.
- QUESTION 5: Calculate and record participant's age at time of entering DRP.
- QUESTION 6: Record participant's race.
- QUESTION 7: Record participant's gender.
- QUESTION 8: Record participant's marital status upon entering DRP.
- QUESTION 9: Record whether or not participant had children. If YES, record number of children dependent upon offender for support.

- QUESTION 10: Record participant's educational background. Check the item which includes the highest school grade completed by participant. Code "GED" as Completed High School.
- QUESTION 11: Record the composition of the household in which the participant currently lives while reporting to DRP.
- QUESTION 12: Record the participant's employment status. Note, any changes in employment while in DRP.
- QUESTION 13: Record whether or not participant has a prior criminal history. If yes, specify types of prior offenses. This information might also be found on the Evaluation, Diagnosis & Referral Form (attached hereto for reference), if available in DRP file, under Section entitled Legal Status.
- QUESTION 14: Record the most serious offense for which the participant was convicted that subsequently lead to participant's referral to DRP.
- QUESTION 15: Record the sentence which the participant received for the conviction which subsequently lead to referral to DRP (i.e., Question 14).
- QUESTION 16: Record the length of the sentence in Question 15 (above) served before participant was transferred to DRP.
- QUESTION 17: Record the agency/institution which referred the participant to DRP.
- QUESTION 18: Record whether or not participant successfully completed the DRP. This may not be directly stated but may be inferred from the Participant's Final Report form and/or the chronological history maintained by CTC or Agent.
- QUESTION 19: Record whether or not participant is Prince George's County, Maryland resident. This may be inferred from participant's address.

- QUESTION 20: Record whether or not participant has any pending charges. This may be determined by results of criminal record searches through NCIC, Maryland State Police (MSP), Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA), Sheriff. This may also be available on the Evaluation, Diagnosis & Referral form at Section entitled Legal Status.
- QUESTION 21: Record whether or not an Evaluation, Diagnosis & Referral assessment was conducted. Record by whom the assessment was conducted (i.e., Prince George's County, Maryland Health Department; DRP staff; Parole & Probation). A copy of a blank EDR assessment form is attached for reference.
- QUESTION 22: Record whether an assessment detected a substance abuse. This might be provided on an EDR form at section entitled Drug/Alcohol Use. If yes, specify participant's substance of choice (i.e., alcohol, drug, multi-drug). List different types of drugs if more than one.
- QUESTION 23: Record whether or not a treatment plan was established for participant. If yes, record by whom the treatment plan was established and record the specifics of the treatment plan.
- QUESTION 24: Record whether or not a participant's academic abilities were assessed. If yes, record by whom assessment was made and state areas where improvement is needed.
- QUESTION 25: Record whether or not participant's vocational abilities were assessed. If yes, record by whom assessment was made and specify special skills/abilities or professional trade.

- QUESTION 26: Record whether or not participant was ordered to fulfill community service. If yes, state number of hours to be served. Dates of actual community service will be recorded in the calendar.
- QUESTION 27: Record whether or not participant was referred to a community mentor while in DRP. If yes, record any dates that participant met with or had any type of contact with community mentor. Specify type of contacts (i.e., phone, in person).
- QUESTION 28: Record whether or not participant violated DRP rules. If yes, record date of infraction and how the DRP staff addressed such infractions (i.e., increased monitoring, electronic monitoring, verbal warning, written warning, termination).

CALENDARS FOR SUPERVISION AND PROGRAMMING:

Fill in dates on calendar from Start Date of DRP to Completion Date. Attached is a copy of a 1994 calendar for assistance in determining the day of week for the start date.

Place an "X" in the box for the date on which each of the listed events occurred. This is somewhat cumbersome in that you must read and interpret the entries in the chronological log maintained by the CTC and the Agents. Attached for reference is a list of abbreviations used by CTC's and Agents for recordkeeping.

A FEW TIPS ON INTERPRETING NOTES:

Code a Job Search as "Job Training Session".

If an Agent places a call to an Employer to verify employment, I have not coded this contact unless and until the Agent actually speaks with an Employer who verifies that a Participant has worked on a particular day.

If a Participant calls the DRP, I mark the calendar at Phone Contact with DRP staff.

If a CTC or Agent calls Participant, I mark the calendar at Phone Contact (successful), (not at home), (no answer), etc.

There is a specific Daily Check In log that records calls to the DRP answering machine (in a calendar format - which should be in file) from which I mark the box on our calendar "Daily Check In". If a Participant checks in twice (AM and PM) I only mark the box once.

APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATION DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

NOTE: Interviews will be conducted with administrative staff for explanation of questions receiving a "NO" response.

Multiagency DRP - Were recruits received from both State and County?

YES NO

Four 90-day Classes: Were 90-day classes of participants established?

YES NO

Screening: Did participants include inmates from County Jail with 90-days remaining on sentence?

YES NO

Were all participants Prince George's County residents?

YES NO

Were all participants free of pending charges?

YES NO

Did participants include State sentenced mandatory supervisees (i.e., parole/probation)?

YES NO

Did participant class include State offenders referred for Parole/Probation technical violation?

YES NO

Were any State participants sent to DRP as a graduated sanction upon leaving the State criminal justice system (i.e., boot camp graduates)?

YES NO

Were participants referred to community resources (i.e., church groups, AA/NA programs, social groups, support groups) by DRP staff?

YES NO

Did local businesses cooperate with DRP staff for employment opportunities?

YES NO

Has public transportation subsidy been established?

YES NO

Central Facility: Does the facility at Landover include the following:

Classrooms: YES NO

Conference Area: YES NO

Lounge: YES NO

Satellite Offices: Are satellite offices available at

Capitol Heights YES NO

Hyattsville YES NO

Staffing: Does the DRP employ 3 Correctional Treatment Coordinators?

YES NO

Does the DRP employ 5 Probation/Parole officers?

YES NO

Does the DRP employ a clerk for administrative support?

YES NO

Do CTCs collect urine specimens? YES NO

Do CTCs conduct breath tests? YES NO

Do CTCs attend weekly team assessment meetings?

YES NO

Do CTCs conduct case management (i.e., meeting with participants, providing counselling, etc)?

YES NO

Do CTCs schedule itineraries? YES NO

Are training programs offered to DRP staff?

YES NO

Has an Evaluation, Diagnosis & Referral (EDR) expert been provided by the Prince George's County Health Department?

YES NO

Is the EDR expert providing addiction evaluation of participants?

YES NO

Is the EDR expert providing referral to County-sponsored treatment programs?

YES NO

Does EDR assistance facilitate rapid admission of DRP participants to County-sponsored treatment programs?

YES NO

Have user fees been established for employed participants?

YES NO

Are participants paying the cost of urine tests?

YES NO

Has an Information System been established to track participants after program completion?

YES NO

Are intermediate sanctions being invoked for DRP rule violations, such as:

Termination:	YES	NO
Disciplinary Hearings:	YES	NO
Forfeiture of Privileges:	YES	NO
Increased Supervision:	YES	NO
Electronic Monitoring:	YES	NO

Has a community advisory board been established?

YES NO

Has community input been received in the treatment of
DRP participants?

YES NO

Has a program to recruit mentors been established?

YES NO

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR DAY REPORTING PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS

1. Did CTCs receive any specialized training?
2. With what qualifications were CTCs selected?
3. Did employed offenders pay for urine tests?
4. Were user fees established for employed offenders?
5. Has an Information Database been established? If so, what information does it maintain.
6. How frequently (or does the DRP) track graduates to assess recidivism?
7. What systems are checked for pending charges?
8. Two participants were accepted into the DRP even though they had pending charges? They were of course terminated. How could this have happened?
9. Were Family Education sessions ever held? If not, why?
10. What happened to the four 90-day classes of 50 recruits?
11. Was recruiting a problem? Give examples of problems encountered.
12. On the State side, what is meant by mandatory supervisees (i.e., recruits to DRP)?
13. Does DRP utilize satellite offices at Capitol Heights (Hampton Mall) and Hyattsville? If so, for what purposes.
14. Did DRP employ 3 CTCs? 5 Agents?
15. Did use of PG Health Department EDR expert facilitate DRP participants rapid admission into County-sponsored treatment programs? If not, why?
16. Why wasn't electronic monitoring used as a graduated sanction for rule violations?

17. Has a Community Advisory Board been established to afford input into participant treatment and to assist in recruiting mentors?
18. Has the DRP received any community input?
19. Has the DRP established a program to recruit mentors?
20. Has DRP coordinated community resources with Church groups? Social services? Support groups? Businesses?
21. Did local business cooperate with DRP staff for employment opportunities?
22. Did DRP ever coordinate with the following entities for assistance: Action Training Institute? Higher Educational Learning Program? Board of Trade? Minority Contractors?
23. What was the problem with COPS serving as a member of weekly team assessment meetings?
24. What happened to each CTC assigned to one of three phases of program development? (i.e., Phase I - interviewing, intake and pretesting, counselling, monitoring service providers and criminal background checks; Phase II - community resource referral, community service projects, counselling and vocational assessment; Phase III - supervision of mentors/volunteers, counselling, job development, community service and continuing care placement)

APPENDIX E

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
College Park, MD 20742

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dr. Doris Mackenzie
(or Faculty Advisor)

Full Committee Review _____
Expedited Review X

STUDENT INVESTIGATOR: Heidi Donaldson

PROJECT TITLE: "Evaluate P.G. County Day Reporting Program"

The University IRB reviewed the above-mentioned project on February 6, 1995 in accordance with Public Health Service grant policy as defined in "The Institutional Guide to DHHS Policy on Protection of Human Subjects," 12-1-71, and in Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46.

The University IRB is:

- Harold Sigall, Professor, Psychology, CHAIRPERSON
- Deborah Speece, Associate Professor, Special Education
- Ethelyn Bishop, Non-University Member
- Margaret Bridwell, M.D., Director, Student Health, Health Center
- Robert A. Brown, Associate Professor, Psychology
- Nathan A. Fox, Professor, Human Development
- Anne Geronimo, M.S., Grant Development Manager, ORAA
- Barbara Dryden, Non-University Member
- Marc Rogers, Assistant Professor, Kinesiology
- Denise Gottfredson, Associate Professor, Criminology
- Susan Zlotlow, ex officio

_____ The IRB has determined that the research is exempt. However, any change in research subjects or protocol will require review by the IRB to maintain the exempt status.
Exemption No. _____

X The IRB effected an independent determination of: (1) the rights and welfare of the individual or individuals involved, (2) the appropriateness of the methods used to secure informed consent, and (3) the risks and potential benefits of the investigation. The IRB has concluded that proper safeguards have been taken by the principal investigator as stated in the research proposal. The IRB approves this project as conforming to University and Public Health Service Policy in protecting the rights of the subjects.

Harold Sigall
Chair of the Institutional Review Board

The Principal Investigator and Program Director, in signing this report, agree to follow the recommendations of the IRB, to notify the Office of the Dean for Graduate Studies and Research of any additions to or changes in procedure subsequent to this review, to provide information on the progress of the research on an annual basis, and to report any instances of injuries to subjects and unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others. Any consent forms used in connection with this project must be retained by the Principal Investigator for three years after completion of the research.

Doris L. Mackenzie
Principal Investigator (or Faculty Advisor)

Heidi K. Donaldson
Student Investigator

THE NEXT REVIEW OF THIS PROJECT IS SCHEDULED FOR 2/96

PLEASE RETURN ONE SIGNED COPY TO THE IRB OFFICE, ROOM 2133 LEE BUILDING, CAMPUS 5121

IRB-3
9/94

TABLE 1
DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION SUMMARY INSTRUMENT

Characteristic	Numbers		
	Total Number of Participants in DRP (Percentage of Total Participants) (n=89) ¹	Number of Participants Successfully Completing DRP	Number of Participants Not Completing DRP
Race (n=88)			
Black	69 (78.4%)	40 (58.0%)	29 (42.0%)
Non-Black	19 (21.6%)	13 (68.4%)	6 (31.6%)
Age (Mean/Standard Deviation: 28.51/6.58) (n=88)			
18-20 years	9 (10.2%)	5 (55.6%)	4 (44.4%)
21-25 years	22 (25.0%)	16 (72.7%)	6 (27.3%)
26+ years	57 (64.8%)	32 (56.1%)	25 (43.9%)
Gender (n=88)			
Male	77 (87.5%)	48 (62.3%)	29 (37.7%)
Female	11 (12.5%)	5 (45.5%)	6 (54.5%)
Educational Background (n=88)			
8th grade or less	3 (3.4%)	2 (66.7%)	1 (33.3%)
9-11	24 (28.1%)	11 (45.8%)	13 (54.2%)
Completed High School	49 (55.1%)	33 (67.3%)	16 (32.7%)
More than High School	12 (13.5%)	7 (58.3%)	5 (41.7%)
Employment Status (n=85)			
Employed			
Part-time	16 (18.8%)	8 (50.0%)	8 (50.0%)
Full-time	22 (25.9%)	17 (77.3%)	5 (22.7%)
Unemployed	47 (55.3%)	28 (59.6%)	19 (40.4%)
Offense (n=84) ²			
Assault	2 (2.4%)	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)
Theft	9 (10.6%)	4 (44.4%)	5 (55.6%)

Characteristic	Numbers		
	Total Number of Participants in DRP (Percentage of Total Participants) (n=89) ¹	Number of Participants Successfully Completing DRP	Number of Participants Not Completing DRP
Drug Offenses	58 (69.4%)	43 (74.1%)	15 (25.9%)
Motor Vehicle Violations	1 (1.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Miscellaneous	14 (16.5%)	5 (35.7%)	9 (64.3%)
Marital Status (n=88)			
Married	4 (4.5%)	3 (75.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Single	70 (79.8%)	41 (58.6%)	29 (41.4%)
Divorced	9 (10.1%)	5 (55.6%)	4 (44.4%)
Separated	5 (5.6%)	4 (80.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Prior Criminal History (n=85) ³			
Yes	71 (83.5%)	40 (56.3%)	31 (43.7%)
No	14 (16.5%)	13 (92.9%)	1 (7.1%)
Prior Substance Abuse History (n=88)			
Yes	62 (70.5%)	36 (58.1%)	26 (41.9%)
No	26 (29.5%)	17 (65.4%)	9 (34.6%)
Composition of Household (live with) (n=86)			
Alone	1 (1.1%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Parent	45 (52.9%)	23 (51.1%)	22 (48.9%)
Spouse	2 (2.3%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
Friend	18 (20.7%)	13 (72.2%)	5 (27.8%)
Sibling	11 (12.6%)	8 (72.7%)	3 (27.3%)
Other Family Member	8 (9.2%)	5 (62.5%)	3 (37.5%)
Other	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Sentence (n=60)			
0-6 months	9 (15.0%)	5 (55.6%)	4 (44.4%)
7-12 months	17 (28.3%)	12 (70.6%)	5 (29.4%)

Characteristic	Numbers		
	Total Number of Participants in DRP (Percentage of Total Participants) (n=89) ¹	Number of Participants Successfully Completing DRP	Number of Participants Not Completing DRP
13-18 months	12 (20.0%)	6 (50.0%)	6 (50.0%)
19-30 months	4 (6.7%)	4 (100%)	0 (0%)
More than 30 months	18 (30.0%)	12 (66.7%)	6 (33.3%)
Source of Referral (n=88)			
County	45 (51.1%)	25 (55.6%)	20 (44.4%)
State	43 (48.9%)	28 (65.1%)	15 (34.9%)
Total Number of Services Received (n=88) ⁴			
25 or Fewer	52 (59.1%)	25 (48.1%)	27 (51.9%)
26-50	26 (29.5%)	20 (76.9%)	6 (23.1%)
More than 50	10 (11.4%)	8 (80.0%)	2 (20.0%)

Notes:

1. The total number of participants to enter and complete the PG DRP in 1994 is 89. Data is missing regarding one participant's completion, therefore the total population represented in this Table is 88.
2. The relationship between offense and successful completion is statistically significant ($p < .05$). In order to perform chi-square test of significance, the offense category was combined as follows so as to avoid small quantities (below 5) in an individual category: DRUG OFFENSES and OTHER (including assault, theft, motor vehicle violations and miscellaneous).
3. The relationship between prior criminal history and successful completion is statistically significant ($p < .05$).
4. The relationship between the total number of services received and successful completion is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

TABLE 1A
DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION SUMMARY BY RACE

Characteristic	Black	Non-Black (White & Hispanic)
Age (n=89)		
18-20	8 (88.9%)	1 (11.1%)
21-25	21 (91.3%)	2 (8.7%)
Over 25	41 (71.9%)	16 (28.1%)
Gender (n=89)		
Male	61 (78.2%)	17 (21.8%)
Female	9 (81.8%)	2 (18.2%)
Educational Background (n=89)		
11th grade or less	25 (89.3%)	3 (10.7%)
Complete High School	38 (77.6%)	11 (22.4%)
More than High School	7 (58.3%)	5 (41.7%)
Employment Status (n=86)¹		
Employed		
Part-time	9 (56.3%)	7 (43.8%)
Full-time	14 (63.6%)	8 (36.4%)
Unemployed	44 (91.7%)	4 (8.3%)
Offense (n=85)		
Drug	46 (78.0%)	13 (22.0%)
Other	21 (80.8%)	5 (19.2%)
Criminal History (n=86)		
Yes	58 (80.6%)	14 (19.4%)
No	10 (71.4%)	4 (28.6%)
Prior Substance Abuse History (n=89)²		
Yes	45 (72.6%)	17 (27.4%)
No	25 (92.6%)	2 (7.4%)

Characteristic	Black	Non-Black (White & Hispanic)
Source of Referral (n=89)		
County	34 (75.6%)	11 (24.4%)
State	36 (81.8%)	8 (18.2%)
Total Number of Services Received (n=89)		
25 or Fewer	41 (77.4%)	12 (22.6%)
26-50	21 (80.8%)	5 (19.2%)
More than 50	8 (80.0%)	2 (20.0%)

Notes:

1. The relationship between race and employment is statistically significant ($p < .05$).
2. The relationship between race and substance abuse is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

TABLE 2
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION SUMMARY INSTRUMENT

Proposed Characteristic	Goal Globally Implemented?	Facts Supporting Conclusions
Implement a multiagency day reporting program?	Yes	Recruits were received from both County and State facilities, as initially proposed
Recruits received from County?	Yes	Evidenced by source of referral
Recruits received from State?	Yes	Evidenced by source of referral
Class Size: Four 90-day classes of 50 participants each?	No	Difficulties in recruiting qualified candidates; classes could not be detected from sporadic dates of entry
Staffing of Day Reporting Program:		
Three Correctional Treatment Coordinators (CTC)?	Yes	Interview with administrator verified level of employment
Each CTC Assigned to a Separate Phase (I, II, III)?	No	Interview with administrator explained change to different method of program operation and development
CTCs collect urine specimens, breath tests?	Partial	In-house testing verified through urine test logs; no offsite testing by CTCs or Agents
Attend weekly team assessment meetings?	Yes	Verified through participant profile reports
Case management?	Yes	Verified through participant profile reports

Proposed Characteristic	Goal Globally Implemented?	Facts Supporting Conclusions
Scheduling itineraries?	Partial	Initial itinerary verified through participant profile reports; revised itineraries scarce
Clerk (for administrative support)?	Yes	Interview with program administrator
Staff training?	Yes	Interview with program administrator
Central Facility:		
Classrooms?	Yes	Site visit
Conference Area?	Yes	Site visit
Lounge?	Yes	Site visit
Satellite Offices:		
Capitol Heights, MD (Hampton Mall):	No	Initially used for boot camp graduate support groups but these groups folded due to lack of interest/attendance
Hyattsville, MD (Justice Center):	No	Interview with administrator
Users Fees:		
For employed offenders?	No	Interview with program administrator
Employed offenders paying costs of urine tests?	No	Interview with program administrator
Establish account for transportation subsidies?	Yes	Subsidies provided by public transportation; researcher witnessed CTCs distribution of same to participants

Proposed Characteristic	Goal Globally Implemented?	Facts Supporting Conclusions
<p>Sanctions:</p> <p>Termination?</p> <p>Electronic monitoring?</p>	<p>Varied</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Evidenced by large percentage (40%) of terminations; participant profile reports indicated varying degrees of sanctions (<u>i.e.</u>, disciplinary hearings, forfeiture of privileges, increased supervision, curfews)</p> <p>Interview with program administrator; not approved for use in 1994</p>
<p>Community Assistance:</p> <p>Action Training Institute, Inc. (ATI)?</p> <p>Higher Educational Learning Program, Inc. (HELP)? [providing supportive services; housing assistance; family services; life skills training; decision making; supervision for peer support groups]</p> <p>Board of Trade?</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Number Uncertain</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Interview with program administrator</p> <p>Interview with program administrator; no evidence in participant profile of actual assistance</p> <p>Interview with program administrator</p>

Proposed Characteristic	Goal Globally Implemented?	Facts Supporting Conclusions
<p>Minority Contractors? [providing on-the-job training; employment; mentors]</p>	<p>Number Uncertain</p>	<p>Interview with program administrator; no evidence in participant profile of actual assistance</p>
<p>Community Advisory Board? [providing community with a vehicle for input in the treatment of day reporting participants; assisting with recruitment of mentors]</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Interview with program administrator</p>

TABLE 3
PROGRAM SERVICES SUMMARY INSTRUMENT

Proposed Characteristic	Goal Globally Implemented?	Facts Supporting Conclusions
<p>Screening:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">County:</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">Inmates with 90 days remaining on sentence?</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">County residents?</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">No pending charges?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">State:</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">Technical violators (Parole, Probation)?</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">Graduated sanction for offenders coming out of State system (Parole, Probation, Boot Camp)?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Partial</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Partial</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Uncertain</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Uncertain</p>	<p>Mainly on County side; difficult to determine through length of sentences being served</p> <p>Verified by local community addresses of participants</p> <p>Verified by various sources during criminal background check prior to acceptance; notes in participants files regarding termination; no evidence of verification in many participant files</p> <p>Source of referral not explicitly stated in participant profile</p> <p>Source of referral not explicitly stated in participant profile</p>

Proposed Characteristic	Goal Globally Implemented?	Facts Supporting Conclusions
Assessments:		
Substance Abuse?	Partial	Verified by EDR testing; not available for all cases
Vocational?	Partial	Verified by EDR testing and CTCs; not available for all cases
Academic?	Partial	Verified by EDR testing and CTCs; not available for all cases
Treatment Plan?	Partial	Developed by CTCs; not available for all cases
Assistance from Evaluation, Diagnosis & Referral (EDR) expert?	Partial	Verified through presence of EDR Reports in participants profile reports
EDR provides evaluation, diagnosis and referral to County sponsored treatment programs for substance abuse offenders?	Partial	Verified through presence of EDR Reports in participants profile reports
Facilitate rapid admission of clients to treatment programs?	No	Interview with program administrator; problems with required fees and waiting periods
Community Resources and Referrals:		
Church groups?	Uncertain	Determined through interview with administrator; assisted with recruitment of mentors

Proposed Characteristic	Goal Globally Implemented?	Facts Supporting Conclusions
Treatment Programs (NA/AA)?	Limited Participation	Attendance sporadic (see Tables 5 and 6)
Public transportation?	Yes	Subsidies provided to participants
Mentors?	Partial	Not available in all cases
Community Service Projects:		
Cooperation with Community Oriented Policing (COPS)?	Yes	Evidenced by participants hours of participation in projects
COPS works with community leaders to establish community service projects?	Yes	Evidenced by location of certain projects
Assist in developing non-profit community service projects?	Yes	Interview with staff; all community service projects non-profit
Serves as member of weekly team assessment meeting?	No	Interview with program administrator
Participants meeting required number of hours?	No	Average number of hours did not even meet 50 minimum hours required of employed participants

TABLE 4
SUPERVISION SUMMARY INSTRUMENT

Proposed Characteristic	Number of Participants Receiving Supervision (n=89)	Average Number of Times Participant Received Supervision
Community Supervision:		
Home contacts (successful): ¹	77	9
Daily telephone check in:	89	66
Daily in-person check in:	89	14
Employer contacts (successful): ²	50	5
Urine tests:	81	7
Breath tests:	51	3
Itinerary:		
Develop/Revise:	66	3
Verification (successful): ³	29	5
Employed Offender Pay Stub Verification:	41	3

Notes:

1. 58 participants received unsuccessful home contacts; averaging 2.
2. 22 participants received unsuccessful employment contacts; averaging 1.
3. 11 participants received unsuccessful itinerary verifications; averaging 1.

TABLE 5
COUNSELLING SERVICES SUMMARY INSTRUMENT

Proposed Characteristic	Number of Participants Receiving Service (n=89)	Average Number of Times Participant Attended in 90-day Period
Counselling (as recommended by EDR expert):		
Individual:	84	5
Group (Peer):	47	2
Drug:	44	3
Alcohol:	14	4
Drug Dealers:	21	4

TABLE 6
TREATMENT SERVICES SUMMARY INSTRUMENT

Proposed Characteristic	Number of Participants Receiving Service (n=89)	Average Number of Times Participant Attended in 90-day Period
Family Education: ¹	0	0
Life Skills:	21	2
Job Training:	42	2
Community Service Projects:	64	43 hours

Notes:

1. PG DRP was unable to implement in 1994.

REFERENCES

Abate, C., 1992. "The Edgecombe Day Treatment Center: On the Path Toward Graduated Intermediate Sanctions." International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, 4(6):24-25.

Allen, J., 1992. "Day Reporting: A Link to the Community." International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, 4(6):23-24.

Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., Hoge, R. D., 1990. "Classification For Effective Rehabilitation: Rediscovering Psychology." Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17(1):19-52.

Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., Cullen, F. T., 1990. "Does Correctional Treatment Work? A Clinically Relevant and Psychologically Informed Meta-Analysis." Criminology, 28(3):369-397.

Baird, S. C. and Wagner, D., 1990. "Measuring Diversion: The Florida Community Control Program." Crime and Delinquency, 36(1):112-125.

Brooks, J. F. and Greene, Jr., J. W., 1992. "Connecticut's Alternative Incarceration Center Network." International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, 4(6):20-21.

Byrne, J. M., 1990. "The Future of Intensive Probation Supervision and the New Intermediate Sanctions." Crime and Delinquency, 36(1):6-41.

Byrne, J. M., Lurigio, A. J. and Petersilia, J., 1992. Smart Sentencing: The Emergence of Intermediate Sanctions. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Clear, T. R. and Hardyman, P. L., 1990. "The New Intensive Supervision Movement." Crime and Delinquency, 36(1):42-60.

Corbett, Jr., R. P., 1992. "Day Centers and the Advent of a Mixed-Model in Corrections." International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, 4(6):26-27.

Cullen, F., 1993. "Control in the Community: The Limits of Reform?" (Paper prepared for the International Association of Residential and Community

Alternatives' "What Works in Community Corrections: A Consensus Conference").

Cullen, F. T., Skovron, S. E., Scott, J. E., Burton, Jr., V. S., 1990. "Public Support for Correctional Treatment: The Tenacity of Rehabilitative Ideology." Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17(1):6-18.

Curtin, E. L., 1990. "Day Reporting Centers: A Promising Alternative." International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, 1:8.

Curtin, E. L., 1992. "Day Reporting - Alive and Well in Massachusetts." International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, 4(6):8-9.

Czaplicki, E. R. and Pirro, 1992. Onondaga County Probation Department 1992 Annual Report.

Davidson, II, W. S., Redner, R., Blakely, C. H., Mitchell, C. M. and Emshoff, J. G., 1987. "Diversion of Juvenile Offenders: An Experimental Comparison." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55(1):68-75.

Diggs, D.W. and Pieper, S.L. (1994). "Using Day Reporting Centers as an Alternative to Jail." Federal Probation, 58, 9-12.

Enax, M. and Coleman, L. E., 1992. "Day Reporting in Houston -- A Horse of a Different Color." International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, 4(6):10-11.

Erwin, B. S., 1986. "Turning Up the Heat on Probation." Federal Probation, 50(2):17-24.

Gendreau, P. and Ross, R. R., 1987. "Revivification of Rehabilitation: Evidence From the 1980's." Justice Quarterly, 4(3):349-407.

Gendreau, P., Paparozzi, M., Little, T. and Goddard, M. "Does Punishing Smarter Work? An Assessment of the New Generation of Alternative Sanctions in Probation." Paper presented at Forum on Correctional Research (in press).

Jolin, A. and Stipak, B., 1992. "Drug Treatment and Electronically Monitored Home Confinement: An Evaluation of a Community-Based Sentencing Option." Crime and Delinquency, 38(2):158-170.

Justice Education Center, Inc., 1993.
"Alternatives to Incarceration Phase I: Pretrial
Evaluation - Executive Summary." Unpublished.

Justice Education Center, Inc., 1993.
"Alternatives to Incarceration Phase I: Pretrial
Evaluation - Full Report." Unpublished.

Justice Education Center, Inc., 1993.
"Alternatives to Incarceration Phase II: Sentencing
Evaluation - Executive Summary." Unpublished.

Justice Education Center, Inc., 1993.
"Alternatives to Incarceration Phase II: Sentencing
Evaluation - Full Report." Unpublished.

Larivee, J. J., 1990. "Day Reporting Centers and
Community Corrections." International Association of
Residential and Community Alternatives, 3(1):4.

MacKenzie, D. L., 1991. "Parole Performance of
Offenders from Shock Incarceration (Boot Camp Prisons):
A Survival Time Analysis." Journal of Quantitative
Criminology, 7(3):213-236.

MacKenzie, D. L., 1990. "Boot Camp Prisons:
Components, Evaluations, and Empirical Issues."
Federal Probation, 54(3):44-52.

Mair, G., and Nee, C., 1992. "Day Centre
Revocation Rates." The British Journal of Criminology,
32(3):329-339.

Mair, G., 1990. "Day Centers in England and
Wales." International Association of Residential and
Community Alternatives, 3(1):8.

Maricopa County Superior Court, Adult Probation
Department, 1993. Final Report of Client Participation
at East Day Reporting Center Educational Program.

Martinson, R., 1974. "What Works? -- Questions
and Answers About Prison Reform." Public Interest, Vol
___:22-54

McCarthy, B. R., 1987. Intermediate Punishments:
Intensive Supervision, Home Confinement and Electronic
Surveillance. New York: Criminal Justice Press.

McCorkle, R. C., 1993. "Research Note: Punish and
Rehabilitate? Public Attitudes Toward Six Common
Crimes." Crime and Delinquency, 39(2):240-252.

McDevitt, J., Pierce, G., Miliano, R., et al., 1988. Evaluation of Hampden County Day Reporting Center, Unpublished.

McDevitt, J. and Miliano, R., 1990. "Day Reporting Centers: An Analysis of Client Characteristics and Program Effectiveness." International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, 3(1):6-7.

McKenna, R., 1992. "Planning For a Day Reporting Center." International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, 4(6):6.

Morris, N. and Tonry, M., 1990. Between Prison and Probation: Intermediate Punishments in a Rational Sentencing System. New York, NY: Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.

Palmer, T., 1994. A Profile of Correctional Effectiveness and New Directions for Research. New York: State University of New York at Albany Press.

Palmer, T., 1992. The Re-Emergence of Correctional Intervention. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Parent, D., Byrne, J., Tsarfaty, V., Valade, L. and Esselman, J. (1995). Day Reporting Centers. U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Parent, D. G., Abt Associates, Inc., 1990. Day Reporting Centers for Criminal Offenders -- A Descriptive Analysis of Existing Program. U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Parent, D. G., Abt Associates, Inc., 1990. "An Overview of Existing Day Reporting Centers." International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, 3(1):5.

Pearson, F. S. and Harper, A. G., 1990. "Contingent Intermediate Sentences: New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Probation." Crime and Delinquency, 36(1):75-86.

Petersilia, J. and Turner, S., 1990. "Comparing Intensive and Regular Supervision for High Risk Probationers: Early Results from an Experiment in California." Crime and Delinquency, 36(1):87-111.

Prince George's County Department of Corrections and Maryland Division of Parole and Probation, 1993. "Drug Control and System Improvement Grant Application (Day Reporting Program)". Unpublished.

Prince George's County, Maryland Day Reporting Program. "Participant Handbook". Unpublished.

Reed, E. A. and Craig, D., 1994. Wilmington Day Reporting Center Evaluation. Department of Correction, State of Delaware.

Renzema, M. and Skelton, D, 1990. "Use of Electronic Monitoring by Criminal Justice Agencies, 1989: A Description of the Extent, Offender Characteristics, Program Types, Programmatic Issues, and Legal Aspects."

Smith, L. G. and Akers, R. L., 1993. "A Comparison of Recidivism of Florida's Community Control and Prison: A Five-Year Survival Analysis. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 30(3):267-292.

State of New York, Department of Correctional Services, Division of Program Planning, Research and Evaluation, 1992. Day Reporting Profile. Albany, NY.

Turner, S. and Petersilia, J., 1992. "Focusing on High-Risk Parolees: An Experiment to Reduce Commitments to the Texas Department of Corrections." Crime and Delinquency, 29(1):34-61.

Turner, S., Petersilia, J. and Deschenes, E. P., 1992. "Evaluating Intensive Supervision Probation/Parole (ISP) for Drug Offenders." Crime and Delinquency, 38(4):539-556.

United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Corrections, 1990. A Survey of Intermediate Sanctions.

Warwick, K. and McCarthy, R., 1990. "The Hampden County Day Reporting Center: The Final Phase in a Continuum of Community Reintegration of Inmates." International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, 3(1):18-19.

Wasserman, C. B., Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, Division of Services to Children and Families, 1991. "Wilder Foundation Day Reporting Center." Unpublished.

Williams, S. D., 1990. "The Invisible Jail: Day Reporting Centers." Corrections Compendium, 55(7).

Zamble, E., Porporino, F., 1990. "Coping, Imprisonment and Rehabilitation: Some Data and Their Implications." Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17(1):53-70.